INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 3. (NEW SERIES.)] MARCH, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" ..	65
The War in Waziristan	72
The Teachings of the Vedas	75
OUR LONDON LETTER	75
Mr. Fowler's Optimism: Sir Auckland Colvin's Reply ..	77
REVIEWS: Macmillan's "Indian Studies"	78
John Russell Colvin	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects..	80
THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN INDIA, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	81
THE EXERCISE OF ARBITRARY POWER IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA, by J. Dacosta	82
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS: Luncheon to Mr. A. Webb, M.P., at the National Liberal Club	84
,, ,, Opinions of the Press	90
Interview with Mr. A. Webb, M.P.	91
Mr. A. Webb, M.P., at Bombay: Farewell Address ..	93

Indiana.

India has been very much to the fore in British politics during the last few days. Indeed there was, at one time, a distinct possibility that the Government would be defeated on account of the imposition of the import duty on cotton goods. This calamity was averted, but it is interesting to remember that it is on an Indian question—namely, simultaneous examinations—that the Government has suffered its only serious defeat. On February 21st, Sir Henry James, who was returned for Bury chiefly by the votes of textile operatives, moved the adjournment of the House of Commons in order to call attention to the inclusion of cotton goods in the scope of Sir James Westland's import duty. There is no reason to doubt that, if Lancashire Liberal members had been willing to vote against the Government in sufficient numbers to defeat it with the aid of Conservative votes, that aid would have been cheerfully given. But the discreditable manœuvre, in which Mr. Chamberlain is believed to have played a leading part, broke down, partly because only four Liberal members would vote against the Government, partly because Mr. Fowler's admirable speech—perhaps the best that he has delivered as Secretary of State for India—recalled at least a considerable number of Conservatives to a sense of duty. A not inopportune attack of influenza prevented Mr. Balfour from attending the House, but Lord George Hamilton, who joined in the attack upon Mr. Fowler, went out of his way to declare that he had the full approval of Lord Salisbury. It is worth noting also that a five-lined whip was issued to the Conservative party, that the Conservative Whips and Lord Cranborne, Lord Salisbury's eldest son, voted against the Government, and that the Conservative papers with one accord refrained from saying a single word before the division to dissuade members of their party from taking this dangerous and unpatriotic course. After the division, it is true, these journals vented righteous if belated indignation upon the 107 Unionists who had supported Sir H. James's separatist motion.

Sir H. James's motion was rejected by 195 votes, and while 101 Conservatives and six Liberal Unionists voted against the Import Duty, only 51 Conservatives and 14 Liberal Unionists voted in support of it. Strangely enough, Sir Richard Temple went into the lobby in favour of making India insolvent. Of the debate itself it is not necessary to say much. The subject has already been fully discussed in the columns of INDIA. Sir H. James's speech was tedious and dull, and suffered by contrast with the lucid and vigorous reply of the Secretary of State. Indians may be amused to find that, while they regard the countervailing Excise Duty as an unwarrantable concession to the demands of Lancashire, Lancashire members in the proportion of 23 to 13 condemn Mr. Fowler for injuring the interests of their constituents. Mr. Fowler made no attempt to explain how the countervailing Excise Duty can be justified on the theory, recently propounded by Mr. Asquith, "that what

we have to regard are the interests of the Indian people, and if in those interests fiscal measures, even though they be injurious to British trade, require to be adopted, both policy and honour demand from us that we should make the sacrifice." The debate had the advantage of bringing the financial condition of India prominently before the notice of the British public, but perhaps it is too much to hope that curiosity will spread from the symptom to the cause, and that a serious endeavour will be made to enforce that policy of economy without which the financial difficulties of India must be permanent. Mr. Fowler is apparently in no hurry to fulfil the promise which he gave last summer that "at the very commencement" of the present Session he would move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the expenditure of the Indian revenues. It seems that after all a Royal Commission may be appointed. Each instrument of inquiry has its peculiar advantages, and either one or the other should be set to work without further delay.

"I am not a pessimist," said Mr. Fowler a month ago in his speech at the dinner of the Northbrook Society to Lord Sandhurst. He is not indeed. On the contrary, so far as India is concerned, he is an incorrigible optimist. He has nothing but amused contempt for the theory that India is on the verge of bankruptcy:

"I understand a bankrupt to be a man who cannot pay his debts, whose liabilities exceed his assets, or he is living beyond income, and that in a very short time the end will come. Now, when these statements are made that India is in that position I think that for one moment I may be pardoned upon an occasion like this in saying why—feeling all the responsibility of the office which I hold—I deny both those statements. The debt of India, which, of course, if we are a bankrupt State we cannot pay, is 105 millions of tens of rupees in India and 116 millions sterling in England; the entire debt to-day being 221 millions, and that is taking the rupee at its old value of ten rupees to a sovereign. Now, what are the assets against this liability? I ventured to say in the House of Commons six or seven months ago: 'I know of no country where the assets are so nearly approaching the liabilities as in the case of India.' (Cheers.) The assets are 140 millions in railways, 29¾ millions in irrigation works, and both these assets are assets producing income; and 16 millions is lent to municipal and other public bodies. These items amount to 185½ millions; and, therefore, the uncovered debt of India is to-day 35¾ millions. That is the real liability of the people of India, of the credit of India, of the resources of India—a sum not amounting to 40 millions sterling. To talk of bankruptcy under these circumstances is talking nonsense."

This amiable description of the position of India is analysed and exploded by the able and candid financier who edits the *Investors' Review*. Mr. Fowler continued his discourse with a reference to the "enormous strain that has been placed upon Indian finance by the depreciation in the value of the rupee." Mr. A. J. Wilson replies that that depreciation itself "is the most striking and obvious proof which could be given that India is going bankrupt." Mr. Fowler says that a bankrupt is a man who cannot pay his bebts. So be it. But does India pay her debts? Why, within the last two years, as Mr. Wilson points out, she has borrowed £6,000,000 in London and has still a large deficit which must be met by further borrowing. These loans conceal the true amount of the deficit in India. Mr. Wilson estimates that if India had paid her debts in London in full, her deficit during the last two years would have amounted to not less than Rs. 200,000,000. Mr. Fowler asserts triumphantly that the assets of India equal, or nearly equal, her liabilities. Mr. Wilson reminds him that there never is a big bankruptcy in which the assets do not exceed the liabilities. But the difficulty is that the assets cannot be realised. "That is just the position of India, and the income from her assets is insufficient to cover the liabilities the possession of them involves." Mr. Fowler consoles himself with the reflection that at no preceding period have the English people taken such an interest in the affairs of India as they take to-day. But this interest was largely aroused by the imposition of import duties which Mr. Fowler justified on the ground that the Finance Minister in India was at his wits' end to obtain revenue in order to meet a deficit.

It is to be regretted that the discussion upon Mr. Naoroji's amendment to the Address failed to extract from Mr. Fowler any more satisfactory assurances in regard to the forthcoming Committee on Indian expenditure. The India Office appears to intend that the investigations of the Committee shall not only have nothing to say to the ability or inability of India to bear her present burdens, but, even in the matter of expenditure, shall also be restricted to something very like a mere audit of accounts. Mr. Naoroji's amendment, which was seconded by Sir W. Wedderburn, and supported by Sir D. Macfarlane, Mr. Seymour Keay, and Mr. Alfred Webb, was as follows:—

"And we humbly pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct your Majesty's Ministers to so adjust the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British-Indian Services, civil and military, in this country and in India, that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer in proportion to the pecuniary and political benefits accruing to the United Kingdom from your Gracious Majesty's sway over India; and that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned."

It will be remembered that the great meeting of the cotton interest which was recently held at Manchester suggested an Imperial subsidy to India as a substitute for import duties. Mr. Naoroji did not ask for a subsidy, but for a fair return for value received. Mr. Fowler's speech in reply was a remarkable exhibition alike of his own optimism and of the

peculiar controversial methods of the India Office. He made a show of testing the value of Mr. Naoroji's conclusions by impugning the accuracy of his figures. Mr. Naoroji's figures, which were misreported by the *Times*, were strictly accurate. They were taken from the Parliamentary Return 192, dated India Office, 13 May, 1892, and entitled "East India (Salaries)." The amendment referred to "the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British-Indian Services, civil and military, in this country and in India." The Parliamentary Return, which has to do only with amounts of not less than 1,000 rupees, shows that this expenditure exceeds Rs. 170,000,000. This was the amount cited by Mr. Naoroji; and a low estimate of the salaries below 1,000 rupees would yield at least Rs. 30,000,000 more, bringing the total up to Rs. 200,000,000. Mr. Fowler's reply, if reply it can be called, referred to the cost of civil establishments alone, and to these in India alone. Such a reply was not at all relevant, and not entirely fair. Similarly, the Parliamentary Return mentioned above shows that the number of "Europeans in the British-Indian Services, civil and military, in this country and in India" receiving salaries of not less than Rs. 1,000 is 29,467, while the number of Eurasians is 6,414, and of natives 17,960. Mr. Fowler's reply, which was again irrelevant, dealt only with the Civil Service, and with that only in India. Mr. Naoroji stated, with strict accuracy, that the gross Indian revenue was Rx. 70,000,000. Mr. Fowler estimates it at Rx. 50,000,000. But he refuses to include land-revenue, and his comparison of taxation in the United Kingdom and in India is vitiated by the fact that he contrasts net revenue in India with something more than the gross revenue of the United Kingdom. The methods of the India Office may be ingenious, but they are not "furthersome."

Special interest attaches to the farewell address delivered by Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., at Bombay, and reproduced elsewhere in our columns. The President of the Tenth Congress went to India a stranger, and the address which he delivered at Madras was, for the most part, composed before he had set eyes upon Indian soil. Mr. Webb left India with the reluctance of a friend:—

"It is not without a pang I quit your shores. Now that the time of departure draws near I find myself saying: 'But two more Indian sunrises, but two more Indian sunsets, but a few more hours of sojourn in that land where I have been treated with such unstinted kindness and boundless consideration.' I can find no better words with which to conclude than some previously given expression to by me. Apart from those family and national ties which to each of us are the first of life's blessings, the choicest gifts of God, I regard this visit to India, this meeting you face to face, this widening of my mental horizon as the highest privilege and one that cannot but profoundly influence my remaining years."

During his brief stay in India Mr. Webb travelled over 3,000 miles and at the end of his visit, crowded with observation as it was, he was surprised to find how little he wished to alter in his Presidential address. The literary exponents of Anglo-Indian officialism are fond of saying that nobody understands India except the globe-trotter who is there to-day and gone to-morrow. "After thirty years in India" one of Mr. Webb's fellow-passengers kindly informed him "you find you know nothing whatever about it." Mr. Webb, in whom there is no guile, estimates this fantastic affectation of modest nescience at its true value. "It would be better," he says, "if such gentlemen said at once what they mean—that no one but a paid official of the Government has ever any right to strive to know anything about India." The cant of philosophic doubt may do very well for the man on the fence, but it will not do for politicians who have to make up their minds and to act. It is not only self-styled "experts" who enjoy the privilege, and possess the faculty, of estimating evidence. Mr. Webb reminds us of Mr. John Morley's dictum that in the United Kingdom one generation after another of cobblers have proved themselves more capable of judging as to the right and wrong of complicated political questions than generation after generation of University graduates.

That Mr. Webb employed his time in India to some purpose nobody who reads his remarkable trilogy on Indian affairs will doubt. He adheres to all that he said about the general character of the Indian Civil Service. "There has," he thinks, "never been any service to equal it. Never, until upon the passage out, did I find myself amongst such a number of strong, trained, able, resourceful men." At the same time Mr. Webb would have Anglo-Indian officials remember that, while they are a splendid instrument, they are not the people of India; that they live for India, India does not live for them. He fears, with only too much reason, that many of them do not realize adequately their position in the country, and do not show enough consideration for the masses of the people. No mistake could be more calamitous and, as it is often unconscious, there are no limits to its possible extent. The quality in the speeches delivered at the Congress which specially struck Mr. Webb was their moderation. He even expresses the opinion that Englishmen, discussing subjects of similar importance in England, would not exhibit moderation in the same degree. Some Anglo-Indian critics professed that Mr. Webb had been asked to curse and remained to bless, and that the moderation of his own utterances disappointed the leaders of educated Indian opinion. No calumny could be farther from the truth. Mr. Webb declares that

alike in public and in private it was his most moderate utterances which were best received. His testimony as to the poverty of the Indian people is specially valuable and noteworthy:—

"If from India I carry away any one impression more definite than another, it is concerning the miserable state in which most of your population appear to be immersed. The evidence of my senses ill accorded with the roseate pictures drawn by ex-officials in the House of Commons."

Mr. Webb's detailed observations on this important subject are reproduced in another column, and they form a sufficient and significant answer to the incorrigible optimism of the India Office.

In regard to education Mr. Webb, in common with all other competent observers, would deplore the possibility of any curtailment of the Government grants. Between 1883-4 and 1892-3 these grants increased from Rx. 2,171,000 to Rx. 3,185,000. In the same period military expenditure in India rose from Rx. 17,155,000 to Rx. 23,012,000. While in England public expenditure upon education amounts 28 per cent. of the military expenditure, in India, where State aid is more necessary, it amounts only to 13 per cent.

"It appears to me," says Mr. Webb, "that technical education is the education here most required. Day by day engineering and mechanical pursuits are affording wider fields for the employment of your young men. It is of importance that they should be attracted into them, that they should learn that they are as honourable a means of living as, and often more independent than, others generally considered more gentlemanly. An English locomotive superintendent on one of your principal lines lamented to me the difficulty of procuring native *employés* in what is a comparatively well-paid calling. An English head gardener spoke similarly with regard to his business."

Mr. Webb referred in terms of high praise to the technical schools at Baroda and at Itarsi, and expressed the natural opinion that what is possible in a native State and at the hands of a small religious society should be possible generally at the hands of the Imperial Government. As to simultaneous examinations, Mr. Webb finds that "there is no question upon which the Civil Service appears more united than in its opposition" to the resolution of the House of Commons. That opposition will have to be removed or ignored. Finally, Mr. Webb exhorts Indians to "hold to this Congress movement as your sheet anchor and sure shield of defence: nothing can imperil or destroy its existence but the abandonment of the safe lines upon which you have hitherto proceeded."

A Bombay correspondent writes, under date January 18th: "Yesterday we had a most successful meeting, which over two thousand people attended. Mr. Webb delivered his farewell address, which, like the Presidential address at Madras, was full of common sense and practical reflections. His opponents were obliged to confess his Madras performance an able one, and I am sure this will be considered equally able. There is no doubt that Mr. Webb is a man of great natural talents and fire. He has really lifted the Congress to a higher platform. What Mr. Yule did in 1888, Mr. Webb has done in 1894, and India is extremely grateful to Mr. Naoroji and Mr. Hume, as well as to Sir W. Wedderburn, for the wise and happy choice they made. Our Bombay address was in a way even better and more practical than the Madras address. The latter was written out before Mr. Webb had set foot on the soil of India, while the former was written after he had seen the country and personally conversed with natives of all shades of opinion, officials and non-officials. Lord Harris wrote a very cordial letter to Mr. Webb yesterday, and invited him to dinner. Mr. Webb is going to Government House to-night. In his address last night he gave credit to the Congress for its moderation and lauds its organisation. He told us that it was our sheet anchor and shield of defence. When he came to this part there were deafening cheers, which echoed through the gallery and outside the Gaiety Theatre where we held the meeting."

The *Daily News* was probably not far wrong when it wrote that the luncheon which was given in honour of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., at the National Liberal Club on February 18th, may hereafter rank as a political event of no slight importance. We print elsewhere a full report of the many interesting speeches which were delivered, but the importance of the occasion did not consist in the speeches alone. A large number of members of Parliament were present, and many Indians who are now resident in London. It did not require a vivid imagination to forecast happy issues from so cordial and representative a re-union. The luncheon was given by a few of Mr. Webb's friends who are interested in India, on the occasion of his return from India as President of the Tenth Congress, and Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., acted as joint secretaries. The prevailing note was one of hearty good will towards the people of India and of admiration for the able way in which Mr. Webb discharged the varied duties of President of the Congress. Mr. Michael Davitt's unadvoidable absence was to be regretted, but he wrote an admirable letter which described faithfully the disposition of Irishmen towards India.

"All Irish Home Rulers are," he said, "naturally proud of the part which Mr. Webb has played in the recent National Congress at Madras, and as we are all friends of India we all rejoiced to know that our distinguished countryman has rendered a signal service to the national cause of India by his able and unanswerable address in support of the principles and programme of the Congress movement."

Mr. Stansfeld, who presided, and whose intention to

retire from Parliament is universally deplored, quoted with approval those passages in Mr. Webb's Presidential address which bade the Indian peoples turn deaf ears to the doctrines of despair and recognised the merits of the Indian Civil Service and the conscience that its members bring to their task of government. Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., expressed the opinion of all who were present when he declared that Mr. Webb had shown the moderation and the sagacity of genuine statesmanship. Edmund Burke is not the only Irishman who has taken a deep and sympathetic interest in the welfare of India. Nationalist Ireland has, as Mr. McCarthy said, always been in sympathy with the aspirations of India, and her representatives in the House of Commons are giving invaluable aid to the cause of Indian reform.

The speech which Mr. Webb delivered in reply to the toast of his health takes rank with the notable address which he delivered at Bombay on the eve of his departure from India. A man of transparent modesty, of critical judgment, and withal of the strongest sympathies, Mr. Webb declared that he came back humbled rather than elated—

> "humbled to think what a small portion of my attention has hitherto been given to the interests of three hundred millions of our fellow-subjects: not elated when I remember how little of the success of the Congress was due to my own puny efforts."

Mr. Webb had nothing but praise, which Mr. Naoroji gratefully acknowledged, for the moderation and excellent organisation of the Congress, while, in regard to the Indians whom he met, he says that to move among them and to look into their faces was to learn to love them with a real brotherly affection. Side by side with this noble sentiment one may well place the statesmanlike utterance of Mr. A. E. Fletcher that Englishmen will never solve Indian problems until they carry out the true imperial idea that empires, like individuals, should learn not to be envied and feared, but to be trusted and loved. One of the most noteworthy passages in Mr. Webb's speech was that in which he referred to the waste of force that is caused by a sense of distrust and suspicion :—

> "As President of the Congress I was greatly impressed, as all through my life in Ireland, with the wealth of intellectual sagacity and devotion which, instead of being made use of for the good of the nations and the empire, lies fallow and unused. In Great Britain and her self-governing colonies this intellectual wealth is freely expended for the good of the community, while in Ireland and in India it is forced into private channels or distilled into bitterness."

Mr. George Russell excited some merriment by reading a letter which he had received from a friend in the India Office. The matter for congratulation is that the sentiments at which the official jeered do not inexactly represent Mr. Russell's wishes in regard to India.

Sir W. W. Hunter, whose speech will dwell in the memory of all that heard it, declared amid cheers that no man was "more desirous to promote the progress of the Indian race." He reminded his audience how, ten years ago, Sir W. Wedderburn and he, as Indian civilians, held out the hand of welcome to the movement which became the Indian National Congress. Sir W. Hunter went further and, with the approval of everybody, and especially Mr. Stansfeld himself, gently rebuked the Chairman for inadvertently applying the term subject-races to our fellow-subjects in India.

> "If," said Sir W. Hunter, "I were asked as an historical student to discriminate between the dynasties of India in the past and the dynasty of India at present, I should say that the great difference lies in the fact that the previous Indian dynasties have regarded the larger portion of the Indian population as subject races, whereas we regard them as fellow-subjects."

Coming from the authority they do, these are significant and memorable words. Sir W. Hunter counselled the Congress to continue in those lines of reasonableness and moderation to which Mr. Webb has borne repeated testimony, and which are cordially acknowledged by all frank and impartial critics. The case for the Congress, so to speak, was fittingly closed by Sir W. Wedderburn, who, as Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, and of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, may be said to be the embodiment of the policy of sympathy and co-operation that he advocates between Parliament and Indian public opinion. The presence of Mr. Webb at the Madras Congress exemplified and stimulated the same wise policy. Nothing certainly could be more foolish, or more suicidal, than that Parliament and her servants in India should manifest an attitude of coldness, of aloofness, or of indifference to the reasonable wishes and the practical suggestions of organised public opinion in India. It is not too much to say that the bonds of friendship, of mutual confidence, and of common effort towards great ends, will have been drawn closer by the important and interesting gathering at the National Liberal Club.

The leaders of public opinion in India will note with pleasure that the speeches which were delivered at the National Liberal Club on February 18th. received considerable attention in the British press. The *Times*, it is true, declined to send a reporter, but the *Daily News*, the *Daily Chronicle*, and the *Manchester Guardian* gave good reports of the meeting and discussed it in their editorial columns. The *Manchester Guardian* in a suggestive article referred to the extent to which Indian methods of Government and the habits of mind derived from their practice colour the political views of Englishmen influential in politics at home. The matter is well worthy of considera-

tion. "Our system of Government in India is" as the *Guardian* says "one of the tributaries which feed the stream of anti-democratic feeling among well-to-do English people of the 'professional' class or thereabouts, and a dim sense of this fact has no doubt a good deal to do with the rising inclination of English Liberals to criticise Indian administration with some severity." In this connection I may remind my readers of an article by Mr. J. E. Mathieson which, under the title "Concerning Anglo-Indians," appeared in the May number of India last year (p. 147). Referring to returned Anglo-Indians Mr. Mathieson asked.—

"Is it not the case that their Indian point of view in regard to the common people is warped and coloured adversely to popular movements, and that the weight of their influence and opinions is on the side of reaction and the refusal of popular claims? Remember that this has been going on now for generations; that few upper or middle-class families have not some connection or relative in the Indian Services, and we can at once perceive how widely the sentiments of this class of men may have prevailed to influence public opinion in a direction contrary to the reform of abuses. Our political leaders have to reckon with this element in the body politic."

The statesmanlike, courageous and eloquent speeches which Mr. P. M. Mehta delivered at a meeting of the Viceroy's Legislative Council at the close of January have caused an amusing flutter in the dovecotes of Anglo-Indian bureaucracy. The first speech referred to the Cantonments Bill, which has been passed into law in accordance with resolutions of the House of Commons and the recommendations of Mr. George Russell's Committee, but in the teeth of opposition from some heaven-born officials in India. Mr. Mehta, whose speeches received the universal and enthusiastic approval of educated public opinion in India, reminded his colleagues in the Viceroy's Council that, after all, "the supreme and absolute authority for the government of this country vests in Parliament." Home Rule for India, he declared, could only mean, for a long time to come, "the substitution of the rule of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy for that of the House of Commons and the Secretary of State as controlled by it." Mr. Mehta added that

"it is safer to rest upon the ultimate sense of justice and righteousness of the whole English people, which in the end always asserts its nobility, than upon the uncontrolled tendencies of an officialdom trained in bureaucratic methods, and not free from the demoralising prejudices incident to their position in the country."

In the second speech, discussing the Police Amendment—that is to say, the "Coercion"—Bill, Mr. Mehta dotted the i's and crossed the t's of this timely warning. The Bill represents, as he said, an attempt, under cover of executive measures for the preservation of order, to convict and punish individuals without judicial trial. Mr. Mehta rightly condemned the measure not only as retrogade in itself but as likely also to demoralise the executive officers whom it concerned.

"I have not the least desire to speak disparagingly of executive officers, most of whom, I have no doubt, are anxious to perform their duties conscientiously and to the best of their ability. But it would be idle to believe that they can be free from the biases, the prejudices, and the defects of their class and position. It is a more common human failing than most people imagine, to mistake suspicions—not unfrequently founded on prejudice and on misleading, unsifted, and incorrect information—for moral certainty."

This speech kindled the ire of Sir James Westland who, in tones of threatrical declamation, described Mr. Mehta's temperate criticisms as "calumnies," "extraordinary observations," and "one general, all-comprehensive accusation impugning not only the capacity but even the honesty and fairness of the members of the most distinguished Service in the world." Sir James Westland's tirade was of course gratuitous and ridiculous, and its author has since discovered that public opinion in India is against him and with Mr. Mehta. The truth is that our servants in India are not content to be servants at all. Their pretensions are of higher reach and ampler bulge. On one side they claim—as witness their action in regard to simultaneous examinations and the Cantonments Bill—power to ignore Parliament, while on the other side they seek—as witness the Police Amendment Bill—freedom to work their own sweet will upon our Indian fellow-subjects. Their motto would appear to be *Imperium et Libertas* in a special and dangerous sense of those words. It is the sort of pride that goes before a fall.

With reference to this important matter, a Bombay correspondent writes:—Beyond the personal aspect of the incident there are important points at issue:—

(i.) The present conflict between the Government of India on the one side and the House of Commons on the other;

(ii.) The present conflict between the bureaucracy in India and the educated Indians who agitate for reforms, and especially the Congress.

Mr. Mehta plainly told the members of the Council that if the Secretary of State had dictated some of the sections of the Cantonments Bill it was but natural after the experience he had had of the way in which Parliamentary resolutions were treated by the official hierarchy in India. The constant effort of this body is to override such orders and instructions, if it cannot evade them by some technical loophole. Mr. Mehta admitted that in rare cases Parliament is swayed by selfish influences. But generally its august authority is of the greatest service to India. All this was gall and wormwood to the bureaucracy. Jesuits in politics as they are, they have been using the Excise Bill and the Cantonments Bill as a handle to discredit Parliamentary

interference as dangerous to the Empire. They want to make this their battle-cry at the present critical juncture, and force the hands of the Secretary of State. In short, the secret strategy is to undermine Parliamentary influence, if not to supplant it altogether, and establish the influence of the bureaucracy so as to oppress our people more, and lay the foundation of a tyranny pure and simple in this country. The governing caste of white Brahmans want to set up here a sort of independent despotism, free from the shackles of the House of Commons."

"The Police Amendment Bill," my correspondent continues, "contemplates absolute arrest of the best citizens under an executive act, and their condemnation without regular judicial procedure. The whole thing is un-English. But the secret aim of the Government of India for many years has been to put a halter round the neck of the Indian, so as to keep him an 'abject slave'—to use Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's phrase—for all times. It was against this spirit that Mr. Mehta directed his criticism. Sir J. Westland tried to intimidate native Councillors by his indignation, vainly thinking that no other member would ever again dare raise his voice against the Government in a similar fashion. Deluded legislator! He hardly understands the spirit of the times and the revolution going on in the mind of educated India. The official fear of Parliamentary interference is aggravated by the strength with which enlightened India is gradually asserting itself. It is not only asserting its self-respect, but showing its power and influence. That power and influence have been seen for the last ten years in our annual Congresses. The Government sees that the Congress movement grows with the growth of years, and that its power to influence Parliament is increasing. It sees that we are asserting our claim for higher employment, and that we are crying out for an intelligent criticism of the Budget and a vote on it, for persistent interpellation, and for a variety of constitutional reforms which, of course, must curtail the power of the bureaucracy. Hence all the efforts to put us down. The attack on Mr. Mehta is really an attack on the Indian reform agitation all along the line. The conflict has begun. Where it will end one cannot say."

As will be seen from our Parliamentary supplement, Sir W. Wedderburn has put a further question to Mr. Fowler on the subject of the dismissal of Mr. Arthur Rogers from his post as an engineer on the Bengal and North Western Railway. Mr. Fowler's reply, which is merely an echo of an official evasion previously attempted in India, is exceedingly unsatisfactory, and the matter certainly cannot rest here. The allegation, for which there appears to be only too much ground, is that Mr. Rogers, to whose thorough competence and energy his late employers testify, was dismissed at the request or suggestion of Sir Charles Elliott and Sir Charles Crosthwaite. Mr. Rogers had previously been used ill, to say the least of it, in respect of an ingenious contrivance of his for the supply of compressed forage to Indian troops. Once bit he was twice shy, and, although long study of the question and close association with native Indian opinion had placed him in possession of a remedy for religious disturbances in India, he hesitated to communicate with the Government of India, until he received a guarantee against persecution. Certain papers of his, however, were illegally seized, and his hand was forced. A question was put in the House of Commons as to Mr. Rogers's scheme for preventing religious riots, and his dismissal followed immediately. That is the reward of a benefactor to whose ability and zeal many officials bear testimony, and a more painful mystery, for mystery it still is in some ways, it would be hard to conceive. If this is the reward of attempts at conciliation, nobody can wonder that religious riots still occur in India. Mr. Rogers's remedy, into which I need not now enter, is to revert to the wisdom of the Mughal Emperors, and he has been able, by means of it, to avert collisions and to render signal service to the cause of public order in India. That such a man should suffer for such benefactions, simply because he may have run counter to the prejudices of certain officials, is monstrous, and the matter calls for prompt action on the part of Mr. Fowler and the House of Commons.

The *Daily Chronicle* of February 15th published a leading article on the dimissal of Mr. Rogers. After referring to the testimonials of officials to Mr. Rogers's ability and services, the article continued:—

"Why, then, should Mr. Rogers have hesitated to communicate with the Government of India? 'My experience,' he says, in his petition to the Secretary of State, dated August 21st, 1894, 'enabled me to foresee that a time would come when some powerful official, or clique, would misunderstand and resent my private life-long interest in such matters, and that is the reason why I did not at first voluntarily offer suggestions (which I knew would be most unpalatable to certain officials) to Government as to the causes of unrest at work in India and the simple remedies for them; and I should not have done so at all until I had procured a guarantee from persecution from his Excellency the Viceroy, had not certain papers of mine been illegally seized by the Bengal Government, and my hand forced against my will.' The papers thus illegally seized were restored with apologies. More than that, Mr. Rogers's measures, in a mutilated form, have been partially introduced by two Local Governments, much to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. The Viceroy in Council is understood to approve of them. Sir W. B. Hudson, President of the Behar Indigo Planters' Association, is satisfied, on communication with both Hindus and Muhammadans, that they 'are well calculated to afford the relief that is needed.' The leaders of both the religious parties concur. Why, then, should such a benefactor of the Government and of the country be hounded from pillar to post with barbarous

ingratitude? And why has the Secretary of State not yet dealt with his petition? Who is the 'powerful official' Mr. Rogers refers to? Who are 'the clique?'"

On January 11th an Indian of remarkable capacity and energy passed away. Babu Protap Chandra Rai began life as a compositor in a Calcutta printing office. He devoted his spare hours to the acquisition of learning, and in course of time started business as a bookseller and general agent. By assiduity and good judgment he accumulated sufficient money to enable him to retire from business; but he resolved instead to exert himself to arrest the decay of religious feeling in his country. His first work was a translation of the whole Mahábhárata into Bengali, which he published at a nominal price. This work occupied about seven years of his life, and then a severe domestic calamity overtook him. He wandered about the country for a time broken-hearted, and almost demented; but his great project at length brought him back to his work, and he began to exhort the people in the villages through which he roamed to set apart every day a handful of rice, and thus raise the small sum needed for a copy of the sacred book. He returned to Calcutta, and devoted his life and his wealth to the task he had taken in hand. Distributing gratuitously all the remaining copies of his Mahábhárata, he immediately set to work upon a second edition of 3,000 copies. The great idea rapidly expanded, and he resolved to establish a permanent institution for the gratuitous distribution of the religious books of India. His enthusiasm spread to others, and contributions of money were made by wealthy Hindus. Fresh editions of the Mahábhárata and an edition of the Harivansa followed, and then the work of Valmíki—the Rámáyana—was published in Sanskrit, along with a Bengali translation.

Many thousands of these famous works have been given away and sold at nominal prices, but the work which has given to Protap Chandra Rai a world-wide reputation is the translation of the Mahábhárata into English. The translation and publication of the 215,000 verses of this vast poem was estimated to cost Rs. 100,000. But the great-hearted man boldly addressed himself to the task, and the monthly parts began to appear. The Indian Government then came to his aid, and undertook to defray the cost of the printing of the national work, and the enterprise also aroused enthusiasm in all countries interested in Sanskrit literature. The name of the energetic scholar became known wherever the Sanskrit language was studied, and his singleness of purpose won for him the cordial co-operation and sympathy of all in India, both officials and non-officials, Europeans and Indians. Protap Chandra Rai fully deserved the honour of the C.I.E. conferred upon him; and he leaves behind him a striking example of perseverance and devotion. In private life he was gentle and courteous, modest and faithful. It is to be regretted that he did not live to see the completion of his last great enterprise, which was rapidly drawing to a close. The institution which he founded—the Dátavya Bhárata Káryyálaya—will, it is to be hoped, finish the work, and do much more in the future to realise the beneficent idea of its great founder.

Readers of India may notice that the list of members of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, which is printed on the cover of this journal, no longer contains the names of Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, Mr. Eardley Norton, and Mr. J. Adam. It may be as well to explain that residents in India who, on visiting London, are elected members of the British Committee cease, by the terms of their election, to be members on their return to India. Thus Mr. Bonnerji and Mr. Eardley Norton ceased to be members of the British Committee fourteen months ago, and it was only through an oversight that their names remained nevertheless upon the list of members. Mr. Adam returned to India last month. In the same connection I may note that Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., who has won golden opinions both in India and in London by his discharge of the duties of President of the Tenth Congress, and Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P., whose knowledge of Indian finance will stand the Committee in good stead, have been elected members of the British Committee during the past month.

Fidus.

THE WAR IN WAZIRISTAN.

An impression seems to have been created that the present war in Waziristan was undertaken to punish the Mahsud Waziris, and other Afghan tribes dwelling on the Western slope of the Suliman range, for incursions and raids committed on our Indian territory. Nothing, however, has occurred to justify such an impression, the raids mentioned in telegrams in the *Times* and other papers being attacks made, not on our territory, but on the military posts which we established in the country of those tribes for the avowed purpose of compelling them to submit to our rule. At the Kabul Conference in November, 1893, Abdur Rahman accepted our proposal that British and Afghan Commissioners should meet with the view of agreeing upon, and marking out, the South-eastern boundary of his kingdom, and he promised at the same time that he would not interfere with any steps we might take for extending our rule over the tract comprised between the boundary line to be agreed upon and the frontier of our Indian Empire. The inhabitants of the tract in question refuse, however, to accept

our dominion, and the British force which is now ravaging their country is charged with the task of compelling their submission. Waziristan is only a part of the Afghan borderland which the British Government decided to subjugate. The early possession of this part is desired for the construction of a railway to connect Dehra-Ismail-Khan with Pishin, as an alternative line to the Scind-Pishin railway which is subject to interruptions from floods and landslips, whereby Quetta is cut off, from time to time, from railway communication with India. The subjugation of the borderland was decided upon in 1876, simultaneously with the inauguration of the "Forward" or "Scientific frontier" policy of the Beaconsfield-Salisbury Cabinet, and, on the fall of that Ministry, caused by the disastrous results of the war undertaken in pursuance of that policy, the frontier expeditions were somewhat reduced in scale until 1885, when the return of the former party to power was followed by a sudden and great increase in the military expenditure in India, and by renewed activity in the war against the border-tribes. A simple explanatory list of the expeditions employed will afford an adequate idea of the heavy drain which that war laid on the resources of India, and may alone fully account for the present difficulties of the Indian Exchequer. At the same time, it is sad to contemplate that the chief result of all the blood and treasure that have been expended during the last eighteen years has been to show to the world how an unwise Administration undertook a task beyond its strength in pursuance of a policy as repugnant to morality and justice as it is inconsistent with sound principles of statesmanship. Accordingly every one of the expeditions enumerated below failed in its object, and, among the numerous tribes attacked by us, not one has been brought under British rule.

LIST OF BORDER EXPEDITIONS ON THE AFGHAN FRONTIER, 1877–95.

1877. An expedition was sent against the Jowakis (a section of the Adam Khel Afridis) with orders to "occupy their territory until they tendered their absolute submission." *Government Proclamation*, November 5, 1877.

1878. A column under Major Cavagnari made a night attack upon the Othman Khel villages.

1879. Forces were sent against the Zamushts and a portion of the Orakzai tribe.

1880. Expeditions marched against the Momands and the Mahsud Waziris.

1881. An attack was made on the Kabul Khel Waziris.

1882. A large force under General Wilkinson invaded the territory of the Bozdars.

1882-3. The country of the Shiranis was invaded on the pretence of our desiring to survey the Takt-i-Suliman mountain.

1884-5. Expeditions were sent north against the Chikarzais, Akazais, and Pariari Syads, and in Southern Afghanistan against the Kaker Khel and the Musa Khel.

1885-6. Operations were resumed against the Akazais, and an expedition marched against the Bunerwals.

1886-7. Operations were resumed against the Shiranis and also against the Bozdars.

1888. A column under Major Battye and Captain Urmston invaded the Black Mountain country, but had to retire the same day, both officers having been killed in the first skirmish.

A column was sent to survey the Gomal Pass leading into Waziristan, but was opposed by tribesmen from Makin.

An army of upwards of 8,000 troops, accompanied by the usual number of camp-followers and 5,000 transport mules, again invaded the Black Mountain country, and reported, on its return that the Hasanzais, Akazais, and other tribes had tendered their submission, and consented to our constructing military roads through their country.

1889. A considerable force, accompanied by the late Sir Robert Sandeman, advanced from Baluchistan towards the Zhob valley, but was arrested by the Kidarais.

1890. Sir R. Sandeman, having entered into negotiations with certain chiefs in the Zhob valley and arranged for subsidies to be paid to them, was allowed to establish a military post at Apozai. Similar means procured promises from the Mahsud Waziris, the Shiranis, and the Derwesh Khel of Wana, that the Gomal Pass would be kept open to trade with India.

1891. The submission of the Black Mountain tribes, reported in 1888, proved entirely delusive, and an expedition was sent to subjugate the country and capture the tribal chief, Hasan Ali.

An expedition entered the Miranzai country on the 26th January, to effect its subjugation and to capture the chieftain, Macmudin. Frost-bite and pneumonia attacked our troops, and after two days a party of sick had to be escorted back to Kohat, which delayed operations until the 4th February. The march over the Zara Pass, though covering a distance of only five miles, occupied the main body eighteen hours, the rear-guard and commissariat stores arriving eight hours later. The troops met with no opposition from the enemy, but suffered intensely from exposure; they returned on the 1st March, after destroying and burning many villages, and leaving a British garrison at Gwada.

1891. Our garrison at Gwada was attacked and overpowered on the 4th April, when they beat a precipitate retreat, pursued by the tribesmen as far as the low hills near our frontier. A British force composed of three columns was then sent into the Miranzai country to resume the work of subjugation. The heat was excessive and water very scarce; "many of our men had been without it for twenty-four hours and were exhausted; the young soldiers of the King's

Royal Rifles, fresh to the country, suffered specially from heat and thirst." *Sir W. Lockhart's Despatch*, 8th June.

1892. Our post at Apozai, established in 1890, had ever since suffered from the hostility of the neighbouring tribes, who resented the presence of our troops, by night-firing into the British Agent's camp, cutting off our soldiers within a few hundred yards of their lines, attacking our convoys and detached parties, and harassing our communications with India. Ascribing these hostilities to the influence of an officer of the Amir, who was stationed among the Waziris, we threatened to send a punitive expedition into the country unless that officer was withdrawn; and the Amir complied at once with our request. But he suggested at the same time that an understanding should be arrived at, as to the limit of our Indian Empire. This suggestion evidently hinted that we had trespassed upon tribal territory or we should not have been exposed to the annoyances we complained of. Our reply, published in a leading article of the *Times* of November 3rd, was that "the British Government would not be lightly turned from its settled policy, and that, unless the Amir fell in with that policy, Afghanistan as a kingdom would disappear." This threat remained unnoticed by the Amir, and no action was taken by us to carry it into effect.

1893. The Waziris, having continued their attacks, we threatened them once more with a punitive expedition, but eventually arranged for a conference with Abdur Rahman, at Kabul, at which a secret agreement was concluded, stipulating, *inter alia*, for the terms mentioned at the commencement of this article. Meanwhile the Waziris persisted in their attacks, even while the conference was sitting at Kabul.

1894. The tribal hostility in Waziristan being unabated, a British force entered the country in the last days of October, and was so severely attacked on the 3rd November at Wano that it was disabled from advancing further during the remainder of the year.

1895. Early in January of the current year, three British columns marched on the principal villages in Waziristan, which they destroyed and burnt, driving away some thousand heads of goats and oxen, and leaving the inhabitants, who had fled, to perish of cold and hunger. Such deeds, resorted to for subjugating neighbouring nations from whom we have nothing to fear, reflect no honour on the nation perpetrating them; and they may be condemned also as violating both international law and sound principles of statesmanship; seeing that the animosity and distrust which they engender must long militate against the conclusion of treaties of peace and amity, which are the legitimate and most powerful means of promoting the prosperity of nations.

Barbarities committed in the heat of battle have sometimes been condoned, when followed by brilliant military success. But these conditions are wanting in the present instance, and it seems a matter for wonder as well as for sorrow and anxiety, that the British people should remain indifferent in view of the inglorious wars which are carried on in their name against weak and unoffending nations, who not unnaturally resist the yoke that we are striving to place on their necks. A very ugly feature in our operations against the Afghan frontier tribes is the distribution of money among their chiefs and headmen, in the expectation that the influence of these leaders will be used for inducing the people to acquiesce in our dominion. The *Pioneer* of November 29th last, referring to the tribal attack made on our camp at Wano on the 3rd of that month, said: "We had a number of friendly *maliks* (tribal chiefs) "with us, who had repeatedly undertaken to win "over the malcontents, and as they had completely "failed, the prospect of negotiations being carried "to a successful issue did not seem a bright one. ". . . . The *maliks* were not unanimous in support- "ing us; some actually joined in the attack. The "enemy had a good idea of the camp, and how "everything was situated; for some of the looters "went straight for the treasure. The money the "enemy divided amongst themselves the next day "at Khaisara." (*Id.*, Nov. 25 - Dec. 2.) "Probably "no more lamentable failure in negotiations with "*jirgahs* has ever been witnessed on the North- "West frontier, than in this instance of Waziristan." (*Id.*, 28th December.) These attempts at conquest through bribery and corruption would appear simply absurd were they not calculated to lower our prestige in the eyes of the Afghans and of our own fellow-subjects in India. They betray on the part of the Indian Administration a sense of irresponsibility and disregard of consequences which is alarming in view of the dearly paid lessons which were taught us by our previous dealings with the same neighbours. The utter worthlessness of bribed agency, such as we are employing in Waziristan, was clearly demonstrated in the war of 1878-80, when chieftains liberally subsidised by us betrayed us at most critical times. For instance, Mr. Howard Hensman, writing from Sir Frederick Roberts's camp on the 26th April, 1880, said: "It seems a pity that a scoundrel "like Padshah Khan cannot meet with his deserts. "He was forgiven for fighting against us in "December; and he now collects his men and "attacks our troops, as if he never had received any "subsidy from us." The annals of that war are full of incidents of the same kind, and Mr. Hensman in his letter of December 24, 1879, the day on which the British army under Sir Frederick Roberts was released from its confinement in Sherpur, wrote: "Our humiliation is so great that to risk a repetition "of it would be ruinous. If we are to hold Kabul, "we must hold it with our bayonets, and not with "our rupees." It seems unaccountable, therefore, that an expedient so doubtful in itself, so un-English and proved to be so useless, should still be resorted to by the Government of India.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE VEDAS.

MR. MAURICE PHILLIPS, the writer of a volume on "The Teachings of the Vedas" (Longmans, Green, and Co.), has drawn most of his statements from the original text and from some of the best authorities who treat of their contents. He has also, as he informs us in the preface, consulted learned Hindus. By these means he is enabled to correct or modify views and interpretations which have been advanced by earlier writers of no mean standing. His account of the acts and attributes of the Vedic gods, of Vedic cosmology, anthropology, and soteriology—to each of which subjects he gives a section—is more full and connected than that given by any of the chief English writers. The divisions which deal with cosmology, anthropology, and soteriology are especially valuable. The section on anthropology enters into details of the Vedic conception of sin, enumerates acts deemed wrong and acts deemed innocent, and considers a question too little discussed—the Vedic belief in immortality. The section on sacrifice does not sufficiently recognise the magic potency imputed to the ceremonial formulae in the age to which the Yajur-veda gives such striking testimony. The very strong additional proof offered by Schröder in his chapters on the Yajur-veda to show the deterioration of religion is not mentioned by Mr. Phillips, though apposite to one of his main arguments. The whole contrast between the Rig-veda, and the Yajur-veda, as pointed by Schröder, would have excellently served the author's purpose. A reference to Mr. Robertson Smith's article on "Sacrifice" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" would probably, also, have suggested other points of view than those to which he has confined himself. His synthesis of cosmology has the merit of clearly displaying the contradictory character of theories which have been too much overshadowed in English works by the more logical philosophies of a later time. In calling the "Physical Gods" the gods "of Poetry," and the "Metaphysical Gods," the gods "of Philosophy," Mr. Phillips uses language which is, at least, ambiguous, for as he himself shows, "the existence of "one self-existent Being is boldly asserted" in the Rig-veda itself, not to mention the Upanishads; and in writing of the "Physical Gods," he does not sufficiently utilise the light thrown by the passage in the very first book of the Rig-veda, "They speak of "Mitra, Varuna, Agni; that which is and is one "the poets call in various ways." As a matter of balance, too, more should have been said of the profundity of some of the teachings of the Upanishads, which, though it is acknowledged by the use of a quotation, occupies a by no means adequate position in the volume. A philosophy which has analogues in the theories of Aristotle and Kant, and which so late a writer as Royce uses to determine present problems, deserved more attention.

The author is sometimes confident where other students, of the first rank, offer other solutions or refuse to pronounce an opinion. Oldenberg labours to prove that the Asvins are the morning and evening star. Schröder rejects the view, and declares the matter uncertain. Mr. Max Müller thinks they represent Day and Night. Sir Monier Williams suggests another interpretation, but Mr. Phillips, without a sign of doubt, simply makes the assertion that they are rays of the dawn. While he seems to have no hesitation in announcing that Aditi was "the unbounded, infinite expanse," Oldenberg, in probably the very last publication on these subjects which bears his name (Die Religion des Veda, 1894,) expresses emphatic dissent from that theory and advances one which, at any rate, does not fall below it in depth and grandeur. Even that *Vishnu* once meant the Sun, is not, by all leading authorities, regarded as beyond doubt, though Mr. Phillips does not make us aware that there is any difference on the subject.

Two parts must be distinguished in this work, viz., the facts supplied from the Vedas and other sources, and the author's reasonings about them. These latter are sometimes difficult to reconcile. On one page he says that the Vedic personification of a natural object as an object of worship "implies "the possession of the concept, more or less clear, "of what *we* denominate God." For "personifica- "tion implies the knowledge of a person," and shows that the Vedic Aryans were "conscious of relation- "ship to something higher than nature." On another page he says they were "ignorant of God as a "definite Being, separate from natural phenomena." Again, he says that though they were thus ignorant, "they possessed a remarkably accurate knowledge of "the actions and attributes which pre-eminently "belong" to God. Attributes imply a being to whom they belong, who is known through them, and are not actions manifestations of an agent? Through what but actions and attributes can anything be learnt about a being at all? The fact that supernatural attributes were "applied indiscrimin- "ately to all the gods" of the Vedic "Pantheon" receives a different light from that which Mr. Phillips gives it, if one remembers Mr. Max Muller's contention—"the old poets never doubted there was "something real of which Agni, Indra and Varuna, "and all the rest were but names; and that that "something was one and one only." All this, however, leaves untouched what we conceive to be a quite obvious fact, that, to a student of the deeper subjects of religion, this work is the most useful manual of the Vedas in the English language.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

In the division on Sir H. James's motion for adjournment on February 21st, the minority who condemned the import duty on cotton goods consisted of 101 Conservatives, 6 Liberal Unionists, and 4 Liberals—total 111. The majority consisted of 51 Conservatives, 14 Liberal Unionists, 46 Nationalists, 1 Parnellite, and 194 Liberals—total, 306. It will be seen that the Conservatives voted two to one against the Government. Among those who voted against the Government were:—Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Chaplin, Sir Edward Clarke, Lord Cranborne, Sir Richard Temple Sir W. Hart-Dyke

Mr. Akers Douglas, Sir W. Walrond, Lord George Hamilton, and Mr. David Plunket. The most important Tories who supported the Government were Mr. Goschen and Mr. Jackson.

The Liberal Unionists of the Birmingham wing were conspicuous by their absence. Of those who voted, six were against the Government and fourteen for it. The five who followed Sir Henry James were Mr. Hamar Bass, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Sir T. Lea, Sir H. Meysey-Thompson, and Mr. T. W. Russell. Mr. Courtney was among those who voted on the other side. The Irish Nationalists voted without exception for the Government. The Parnellites abstained, with the exception of Mr. Maguire, who supported the Government. The number of Liberal malcontents was only four—namely, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Leese, Mr. Maden, and Mr. Philip Stanhope.

Taking the fifty-seven members who sit for Lancashire constituencies, we find that twenty-three voted against the Government, and thirteen for the Government. These thirteen were all Liberals—namely, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Holland, Mr. Leigh, Mr. Leake, Mr. Mather, Mr. Nevill, Sir H. Roscoe, Mr. Roby, Mr. Snape, Mr. Schwann, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Woods, and Mr. Wright. The Liberals who were absent (including those who were paired on one side or the other) were Mr. J. Williamson, Mr. Smith, Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. C. P. Huntington, Mr. T. B. Potter, Mr. Holland, Mr. Cheetham, and Sir J. Hibbert.

Members flocking out into the lobby upon the conclusion of Mr. Fowler's speech were unusually enthusiastic in their appreciation of its weighty merits. The general opinion was put in a sentence by a Conservative member, intimately connected with the Lancashire cotton trade, who said: "The speech has knocked the bottom out of the business."

The Parliamentary representative of the *St. James's Gazette* said that Mr. Fowler's speech was one of the best things, perhaps the best thing, he has done in the House of Commons. "The main arguments by which the conduct of the Government is to be defended are already sufficiently familiar; but they were put by Mr. Fowler with a clearness and precision which alone, from the point of view of the Government, would have justified the debate. No one watching the House of Commons while the speech was being delivered could fail to see that the purely argumentative part of Mr. Fowler's reply was seriously shaking the confidence of his critics. But the part of the speech which most affected the general body of the House was when the technicalities and the minutiæ of the subject were abandoned for a broad view of the whole problem as it affects the relations of India and England. From his armoury of notes Mr. Fowler produced three or four passages from speeches delivered in the House of Lords last summer by Lord Lansdowne, Lord Roberts, and Lord Cross. With a sense of real responsibility the House of Commons listened in absolute silence to these grave warnings of men who have been more directly responsible for the government of India."

Writing after the division, the *Times* (Feb. 22nd) said:—"The rejection of Sir Henry James's motion for the adjournment of the House of Commons last night saved the Government from a defeat which would have compelled them either to resign or dissolve, but in our opinion it saved the Unionists from a far more serious calamity. We rejoice that the majority of 304 against 109 was so large and decisive as to deprive the division of the character of a party vote. We regret that Mr. Balfour is suffering from indisposition which confines him to his room, but his absence from the debate was not to be regretted; and if some of his colleagues had been also cempelled to absent themselves, it would have been an advantage to them and to their party. . . . . But an impression prevailed that the bulk both of the Conservatives and of the Liberal Unionists were prepared to support the motion for adjournment. If they had been successful in doing so, what would have happened? They would have come into office, before or after a General Election, pledged to support the repeal of the Indian cotton duties and, by some means or other, to fill up the deficit left by the withdrawal of that source of revenue. As the great majority of those who have been prominent in demanding the change are in favour of bimetallism, the success of the motion would not only have pledged the Opposition to views inconsistent with the Imperialist principles on which alone we can continue to govern India with honour and safety, but would have cast grave doubts on their fidelity as a party to sound economical doctrines."

The danger which threatened the Government may be judged from the following passage written by the Parliamentary representative of the *Daily Chronicle* on February 21st: "It is quite possible—and I give not my own calculation but that of Ministers—that the Government will be beaten if a division be taken on Sir Henry James's motion for adjourning the House this afternoon in order to call attention to the Indian import duty of 5 per cent. on English cotton goods. I must say, after careful deliberation, that if matters stand as they stood at the adjournment of the House yesterday afternoon, the Government may well be defeated. Sir Henry James's motion has long been an overhanging and a heavy cloud. Now it has seemed no bigger than a man's hand, and now again it looms near and black with peril. I think it is fair to say that this worsened prospect, so far as the Government are concerned, arises from from a serious and a strange modification of Conservative policy. There can be no doubt whatever that in the earlier stages of this question Mr. Arthur Balfour was not inclined to press the Government too hard, or to put his private interests as a Lancashire member against his duty as the leader of a great party, and a probable Prime Minister, and against the possible bankruptcy of India. Since then, and I desire to speak with every reserve, the situation has changed. Mr. Balfour—who at first was disinclined even to challenge a division on the question—has it is said been influenced by Mr. Chamberlain's forcing policy, which has been conspicuous all through the debate on the Address, and is hardening on a decision to throw the Government out on any issue and by any combination that offers."

The *Daily Chronicle* wrote on the day following the

division:—The Unionist party unquestionably hoped to overturn the Government on the Indian cotton duties. Finding that it had no moral or numerical force behind it, it retreated in undignified haste from the position into which Mr. Chamberlain's haste and Mr. Balfour's weakness had all but driven it. The issue should be an encouragement to the Government. The Unionist party is undergoing a serious process of demoralisation. In one division it allies itself (always in the interests of the Union and the Empire) with a body of Irish extremists. The next day it is willing to risk the bankruptcy of India in order to curry favour with the cotton spinners of Lancashire. From this position, Mr. Goschen, in Mr. Balfour's unfortunate absence, was obliged to retreat, horse, foot, and artillery. The so-called "Separatist" party was able to put in an unanswerable plea for the common interest, and to demonstrate that in the main it stood both for the honour and for the safety of the Empire. For the moment its hold on the country is greatly strengthened. It has been able to show either that the Opposition has no policy, or that where it ventures on a departure of its own, it works in the direction of unpatriotic intrigue. We recommend it to drive that consideration home to the mind of the people, and to improve its triumph of yesterday at the expense of the party which would disintegrate India, divide London, and alienate Ireland—all in the sacred cause of the unity of the Empire.

Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., has given notice that he will call the attention of the House of Commons to the administration of Civil and Criminal justice in India, and will move a resolution.

Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P., has given notice of motion as follows:—"That, in the opinion of this House, no reference to a Select Committee or Royal Commission on Indian affairs will be satisfactory which excludes inquiry into the economic condition of the people of India and their ability to bear their existing financial burdens."

MR. FOWLER'S OPTIMISM.

SIR AUCKLAND COLVIN'S REPLY.

The following letter from Sir Auckland Colvin has appeared in the *Times*, in reply to the speech delivered by Mr. Fowler at the dinner of the Northbrook Society on January 29th, and discussed in "Indiana":—

Mr. Fowler deprecates what he terms pessimistic views on Indian finance, on the grounds, first, that the assets of India are only 35¾ millions less than its liabilities; secondly, that in the last 14 years there have been 11 years of surplus, and only 3 of deficit, the surplus having amounted to 24, the deficit to 3 millions; thirdly, that the credit of India has enabled it recently to convert 95 millions of debt from a 4 per cent. to a 3½ per cent. stock. To speak, therefore, of bankruptcy in connection with India is "absurd" and "untrue." "I understand," adds Mr. Fowler, "a bankrupt to be a man who cannot pay his debts, whose liabilities exceed his assets, or he is living beyond his income, and that in a very short time the end will come."

As to the assets of India, it may be noted that, though their rupee value is rising, the gold value of her liabilities is also increasing rapidly. But stock-taking is not the only or the best means of testing financial stability. The problem is not how to face liquidation, but how to avoid it. If India can balance revenue and expenditure; if the burden of taxation is not progressive; if taxation is not in danger of becoming excessive; if there is a further safe margin of taxation to meet unavoidable claims, India is amply solvent. Otherwise, while the balance of her liabilities is progressing, her means of meeting them are approaching exhaustion. How does such a situation usually end in the long run?

At the risk of being written down a pessimist, let me review briefly each of the above postulates.

"There has been a surplus in 11 of the 14 years from 1881." Is this so? Do the accounts show this? But we have to deal with the present and the future, not with the distant past. It may be contended that past experience throws light on future prospects. Very good; but, in that case, if we are to compare like with like (and any other mode of comparison is misleading), comparison must be limited to the last decade. The present dual policy—the policy, that is to say, of a vigorous development of internal resources simultaneously with an energetic military administration—dates from 1885. That is the only possible starting point of comparison. What does it show? Unless I am mistaken, we find that since 1885 there have been four years of deficit; that, in the current year, deficit is again apprehended; that in one year there has been bare equilibrium; surplus in four years only. This, again, was mainly due to a momentary rise in exchange and to temporary causes.

Note, too, that the last surplus dates four years back, in 1891-92. Note, further, that surplus, such as it was, during the last decade was not due to normal growth of revenues. In the hope of regaining equilibrium more than four millions of fresh taxation have been imposed since 1885. Another million has been diverted from the Famine Insurance grant to current needs. Nearly half a million has been taken from the balances at the credit of provincial administrations, which find themselves now without funds for any further material improvement.

As to the remaining postulates, it is not necessary to remind your readers that taxation has been progressive in the last decade. All who are acquainted with the Indian finance know that the burden of taxation is in danger of becoming excessive, and that the further margin of resource to which taxation can be applied is incredibly small, both in itself and from pressure of political considerations.

To return to Mr. Fowler's three tests. If Indian assets at present do not fall greatly short of Indian liabilities, it is certain that she is living beyond her income. But does she pay her debts? What of her gold liabilities? Has not the Secretary of State borrowed largely in 1893 and 1894 in England to meet his gold engagements? Does anyone suppose these loans will prove temporary only—mere accommodation loans? Can the gold liabilities of the coming year be met by the Secretary of State's drawings, or will further loans or kindred expedients be needed? As to the credit of India, it is high for borrowing purposes, because the ultimate responsibility for the administration of India rests on Great Britain. It may be that the investing public attach undue importance to the connexion; but the credit of India will remain high so long as their estimate of the value of such connexion continues whatever may be the state of its finances. "Pessimists" hold that in the crisis through which India is passing it is necessary to reduce expenditure to a *minimum* and to nurse every possible item of receipt. Railways, if not, as Sir Juland Danvers puts it in his letter published in your issue of February 2nd, the sheet anchor of Indian finance, furnish, next to land revenue, the most elastic item among Indian

receipts. At a time when taxation is being constantly added to, the railway account in the Budget, in consequence of constant construction of new lines some of which are unproductive, adds nearly two million to the deficit. No one, doubts the stimulus given to trade and industry by railway construction. No one on the other hand, can fail to see that when such construction is accompanied by recurring taxation (by import duties, for example), and when current revenue is diverted from administrative needs to meet or to lessen deficit, trade and industry are liable to be hampered. The same financial difficulties which have unhappily compelled the Indian Government to place an import duty on English piece goods seem to disqualify it at present from continuing to be England's customer for large consignments of railway plant. Not only is capital annually borrowed for extension of railway construction works, but (deficit recurring annually) interest on such capital must be also borrowed. All this time expenditure exceeds income. There is no visible chance of any relief from the pressure of exchange; and the fiscal reserves of the Government are approaching a point when they will no longer be able to furnish much increased supply.

Reviews.

MACMILLAN'S "INDIAN STUDIES."

The Globe Trotter in India Two Hundred Years Ago; and other Indian Studies. By MICHAEL MACMILLAN, B.A. (Oxon.), Fellow of the Bombay University and Professor of English Literature at Elphinstone College, Bombay. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co.)

Nearly the whole of the contents of this charming and suggestive volume have already appeared in various periodical papers published in Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. Professor Macmillan has judged rightly, however, in believing that their republication in a collected form will be welcomed by a far wider public than they are likely to have reached in separation. The papers that give the title to the volume occupy about a quarter of the whole number of pages, and the original essays which complete the work are full of most interesting matter, treated with ample knowledge and with the lucidity that comes of mastery of the subjects.

The globe-trotter resuscitated by Professor Macmillan is Gemelli Careri, an Italian doctor in civil law with vagabond blood in his veins. Impelled by a keen curiosity, Careri started on his journey round the world in June, 1693, and reached home again in December, 1699. He had already exhausted Europe in 1683, and during his six years' wanderings in the East he visited Egypt, the Holy Land, Turkey in Europe and in Asia, Persia, India, and China. Professor Macmillan, however, is mainly concerned with Careri's experiences in India. He has followed the translation in "Churchill's Voyages," expressing in his own language the substance of the story, and occasionally condensing Careri's diary. At the same time he intersperses comments of his own. Altogether he gives an admirable presentation of the more salient points of Careri's narrative, and brings out very effectively the main elements of contrast with the conditions of the present day. The extraordinary passage that Careri made between Bander Congo and Damaun in a Moorish ship illustrates the dangers to travellers from the egregious ignorance and cowardice of the officers and crew. The pilot had come at a venture, having been simply a tobacconist at Congo; and the captain, though capable of convicting the pilot of inexperience, was anxious, in moments of difficulty, to resign his duties to the intelligence of Careri. With their united seamanship they made their voyage about twice as long as it ought to have been, to say nothing of the multiplication of dangers. At Careri's visit, Surat was still the principal port of India, "all nations in the world trading thither, no ship sailing the Indian Ocean but what puts in there to buy, sell, or load." It is a pity that Careri did not leave behind him a detailed description of the city; but he stayed only a few days. There is especial interest in Careri's expedition from Bassein to the Buddhist caves at Kennery, some twenty miles from Bombay, on the island of Salsetta; in his description of Goa, the metropolis of Portuguese India, then far gone in decline; and in his arduous and adventurous visit to the great Mughal's camp at Galgala.

"What strikes us most, perhaps, when we attempt by the help of Gemelli's travels to estimate the progress made by the world in the last two hundred years is his great credulity. In this respect there is far less difference between him and Herodotus, who lived more than two thousand years before him, than between him and an ordinary nineteenth century traveller. We have no reason to think that Gemelli was exceptionally credulous for his age. He was an educated man, and as a doctor of civil law must have had some practice in sifting evidence. His frequent criticisms of Tavernier show that he knew well enough that travellers were in danger of being misled by the deceitfulness of their informants or by misunderstanding. Yet he was ready to accept numberless statements that no educated man of the present day would think worthy of a moment's consideration."

The examples cited by Professor Macmillan fully bear out this statement. Still, there is a great deal of interest, as well as of value, in his narrative, and it would be too exacting to require even a doctor of civil law to rise definitively above his age and times.

Professor Macmillan writes a sympathetic and kindly critical notice of "An Anglo-Indian Man of Letters," Mr. Curwen of the *Times of India*, who broke down somewhat suddenly and died in 1892. His comments on Mr. Curwen's contributions to literature, under pressure of journalistic work, if considerate, are yet justly discriminating. The chapters on "Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases" and "Some Indian Proverbs" contain numerous points of great interest to students of language and of society. "From a philological point of view," says Professor Macmillan, "India is now in a position similar to that of England immediately after the Norman Conquest, and to her own former position at the period of her history when Muhammadan invaders introduced Persian and Arabic into the country."

"The philological results of the British Empire in India may be briefly summed up as follows: firstly, that many Indian words have been introduced into the English language; secondly, that many English words have been introduced into the vernaculars of India; and thirdly, that several English words and several Indian words have assumed new senses and new combinations, owing to the social intercourse between Englishmen and natives of India."

The interest lies in the full and judicious illustra-

tion of the operation of processes. The comparison of English and Indian proverbs is extremely well presented. Professor Macmillan is under no illusion as to how far these proverbs illustrate the real qualities of the masses of the peoples. As to the Indian proverbs, he denies them any great subtlety or masterly employment of language, but admits "they contain, except in few exceptional cases, a great amount of practical shrewdness expressed in homely words and illustrated by simple examples." The excellent papers on "Indian and Homeric Epics"—the Rámáyana and Mahábhárata compared in selected points with the Iliad and the Odyssey—and the "Morality of the Mahábhárata," while popular in form, will be especially interesting to students of classical poetry and the history of moral ideas. The resemblances between the epics of India and Greece "might possibly be attributed, if no other alternative were possible, partly to similarity of subject, partly to the common origin of the Greeks and Indians, and the consequent similarity of manners and customs that remained until the advance of civilisation and difference of climate and other circumstances had begun to obliterate their original resemblance." But Professor Macmillan thinks it "more natural to account for them by the indirect connection between Indians and Greeks that must have existed in the beginning of the fifth century before Christ." The hints towards the working out of this theory form one extremely interesting feature of the essay on this subject.

There remains the most valuable paper of them all, on "Heredity and the Regeneration of India." Professor Macmillan does not assume, but concludes from a careful and effective marshalling of facts, that "the intellectual and moral character and the physical strength with which a child begins life are entirely, or almost entirely, derived from its parents." He next inquires "whether a child derives more of its original character from its father or its mother, and whether any distinction can be made between the inheritance derived from the two parents;" and he concludes that, on the whole, "mothers and fathers exert an equal influence." He is now in a position to apply the doctrine of heredity to the question of the regeneration of India.

"Why is it that India, which in the golden ages of Sanskrit literature was in the forefront of the world's civilisation, has been for the last thousand years in a backward condition, while other nations have been progressing rapidly and far outstripping her in the race? Why is it that the nation, that in the past produced poetry and philosophy fit to rival the masterpieces of Greece, has for so many centuries produced no literary work of high rank, no great poet or dramatist, or historian, or philosopher, no great name in literature, no man of first-rate eminence in political life since Akbar—and even he, though an Indian by birth, belonged to a family but newly settled in India? No single cause can account for this strange retrogression, but I am convinced that the consideration of heredity plainly shows that the principal cause has been the practice of female seclusion, which appears to have gradually become more prevalent and stringent rom the date of the earliest Aryan invasion of India, and come to a climax at the time of the Muhammadan conquest. If you accept the law of heredity—and I think you cannot refuse to accept it—the practice of female seclusion must constantly tend to national deterioration, to diminution of physical, intellectual, and probably also moral strength in each successive generation."

Professor Macmillan simply sketches the broad lines of his argument, but he puts the main points in a very popular and effective manner. It is to be hoped that his suggestions will duly impress the leaders of native thought, and prove fruitful of results. For there is probably no other single idea that is fraught with more important consequences for the India of to-day.

JOHN RUSSELL COLVIN.

Rulers of India: John Russell Colvin, the last Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West under the Company. By Sir Auckland Colvin, K.C.S.I., K.C.M.G., C.I.E. Clarendon Press.

John Russell Colvin was educated at the University of St. Andrew's and at Haileybury College, whence he passed in his nineteenth year to India. He gave evidence of great promise in mathematics and classics and at the College at Fort William, where he passed the first few months of his life in India, he distinguished himself in Persian. In 1826, during his first year of residence, he was appointed Assistant to Mr., afterwards Sir, William Macnaghten, but in less than twelve months was set free from this routine work and sent to Cuttack as Assistant to Sir Henry Ricketts. After another transfer to Haidarabad, he returned to Calcutta in 1830 to take an appointment in the Revenue and Judicial Department with Mr. Macnaghten again as his chief. He rose in the Service, and obtained during this time a wide and most valuable knowledge of Indian affairs. The time was pleasantly spent. Social life at Calcutta then offered exceptional advantages, and Mr. Colvin became one of the accomplished circle which centred in Macaulay. He was a member of the Committee for Public Instruction, and warmly supported Macaulay's views as to the introduction of English education. In 1836 Lord Auckland succeeded Sir William Bentinck as Governor-General, and immediately on his arrival offered the post of Private Secretary to Mr. Colvin. He accepted it, and entered upon duties which, arduous as they could not but be, were destined to become specially important in this case. Organisation is much more complete now than it was then, and every affair has not to pass through the Private Secretary's hands. Continual intercourse with the Home Government has changed the character of the work, and deprived it of some of its responsibility. Mr. Colvin has never been accused of any lack of ardour in the manner in which he discharged his duties. All his energies were placed at Lord Auckland's disposal. But this fact itself has drawn upon him comment of a different kind. "The very excess of the Private Secretary's pleasure at his master's triumphs, the depth of his distress at his master's humiliation, were regarded in some quarters as presumption amounting to proof that the measures with which he so warmly identified himself must have been of his own inspiring." Lord Auckland's career in India is made memorable by the disastrous war in Afghanistan, and Sir John Kaye has not hesitated to say, nor others to repeat, that the war was mainly due to the influence of Macnaghten, Torrens, and Colvin. Affairs on the North-Wes

Frontier were in an unsettled condition when Lord Auckland reached India; Sir William Bentinck had left behind him a Minute calling the attention of his successor to the facts of the case. The Government decided to adopt as pacific a course as possible and Lord Auckland came to India with the avowed intention of interesting himself in matters of domestic legislation. The incidents which led up to the unfortunate and calamitous change of policy are detailed at some length, and by means of extracts from the despatches sent and received by Lord Auckland the author endeavours to clear his father from Sir John Kaye's imputations. The character of the Governor-General appears in another light than that of a man easily led by his subordinates to adopt a line of action disapproved by the members of his Council. It is urged that the despatch from the Secret Committee, which crossed Lord Auckland's despatch bearing the news of the declaration of war with Afghanistan, exonerates him from having acted in opposition to the Government, and that this was persistently ignored by Sir John Kaye at a time when he must have had access to so important a document. In 1842 Lord Auckland was recalled, and Colvin accompanied him on furlough to England, where he remained till 1845. On returning to India Colvin assumed charge of the Nepal Residency, was afterwards ordered to Maulmain, and remained there till 1848, when he went to Calcutta as a Judge of the Company's Chief Court of Appeal. In the two last capacities he met with signal success, and spent pleasant and useful years in Calcutta, till in 1853 he was selected by Lord Dalhousie to succeed Mr. Thomason as Governor of the North-West Provinces. This post he held till his death in 1857—an event which was overshadowed by the Mutiny. His conduct during that outbreak has been impugned. He has been accused of acting in too vacillating and conciliatory a manner. His offer of pardon was misconstrued, and the misconstruction has been repeated. The difficulties of his position were great, his resources small, he was cut off from help, and his bodily health was failing. On the 9th of September, shortly before the fall of Delhi, he died. He was associated with two of the most evil days on which British rule in India has fallen. It was well-nigh impossible that a name so conspicuous should pass unsmirched by report, and until now that report has passed almost unchallenged. Undoubtedly his great ability and his spotless integrity entitle him to a high place in that long roll of eminent civilians who served under the East India Company. The present volume, carefully written by Sir Auckland Colvin, brings to a fitting close a valuable and interesting series.

Sir William Wedderburn, M.P. has given notice that he will move in the House of Commons for a Return, prepared by Mr. James Bryce, M.P., showing expenditure incurred out of the revenues of India on the construction of railways and roads, and on military expeditions and explorations, and subsidies to native chiefs beyond the West and North-West frontier of India, from April, 1882, to March, 1891.

BIBLIOGRAPHY of ARTICLES in MONTHLY and QUARTERLY MAGAZINES on INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1895.

Arena (Gay and Bird). Gandhi, V. R., "Christian Missions in India as viewed by an Eastern Scholar."

Board of Trade Journal (Eyre and Spottiswoode). "The Foreign Trade of British India."

Calcutta Review (Kegan Paul). Johnston, C., "The Dawn of Indian Research." Dutt, R. C., "Modern Progress in India." Biddulph, C. E., "The Berars." "Bengal: Its Castes and Curses." Hope, C. W., "The Edinburgh Academy in India."

Edinburgh Review (Longmans). "Twelve Years of Indian Government."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). G. F. S., "Great Women in Eastern History." Pope, Rev. G. U., "Ethics of Modern Hinduism."

New Review (Wm. Heinemann). Keary, C. F., "India: Impressions."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1895.

Haig, Major-General, M. R., M.R.A.S. ...."The Indus Delta Country." (Kegan Paul.) .... 5s. 0d.

Cowell, E. B. (Editor)..........."The Jataka, or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births." Vol. I. Translated by Robert Chalmers, of Oriel College, Oxford. (Cambridge, University Press) net. .... 12s. 6d.

Colvin, Sir Auckland, K.C.S.I. ...."John Russell Colvin: The Last Lieut-Governor of the North-Western Provinces under the Company." (Henry Frowde) .... 2s. 6d.

Muddock, J. E. ...."The Star of Fortune, Story of the Indian Mutiny." (Chapman and Hall) .... — —

Wilson, Annie C. (A. C. MacLeod)........"After Five Years in India, or Life and Work in a Punjab District." (Blackie and Son)...... 6s. 0d.

"The India List, Civil and Military, 1895. (W. H. Allen and Co.)......................... 10s. 6d.

Douglas, William ...."The Indian Exchanges, Considerations for Remitters." Paper. (Manchester: Palmer Howe & Co.) — —

Cave-Browne, Rev. John............."Incidents of Indian Life." Second Edition. (Maidstone: W. P. Dickinson) .... 2s. 6d.

Hallett, Holt S. ...."Lancashire's Case Against the Indian Import Duties." (Blackburn: J. and G. Toulmin) .... — —

Maclean, James Mackenzie..........."A Guide to Bombay." (G. Street and Co.)........ Rs. 5.

"Progress Report of the Archæological Survey of Western India, May, 1893, to April, 1894. (Government of Bombay, General Department) .... Ans. 4.

Burgess, James, C.I.E., LL.D. (Editor) "Epigraphia Indica." A Collection of the Indian Inscriptions of the Archæological Survey. Vol. II. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing) .... Rs. 16.

"The India Office List, 1895." Compiled by direction of the Secretary of State for India. (Harrison and Sons) .... 6s. 0d.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MARCH, 1895.

THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN INDIA.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

In English views of India, the principal actors on the scene, it may safely be said, are the Government and the National Congress. The Government is always in evidence; and when the National Congress held its annual meeting in the end of December, all eyes turned for the occasion to Madras. Very little attention, comparatively, seems to have been given to the numerous meetings of social bodies in various parts of the country which were being held about the same time. Even the annual meeting of the National Social Conference, though it also assembled at Madras on the 30th of December, was quite overshadowed by the National Congress. Mr. Justice Ranade, of Bombay, addressing the Hindu Social Reform Association two days before, spoke of the National Social Conference as "a humble sister of the National Congress." The seven years' survey of Mr. Ranade's speech, together with the subsequent proceedings of the Social Conference, may, however, fairly suggest a doubt whether that "humble sister" may not, in the long run, prove to be the Cinderella of the family. The mental ferment of modern India may be regarded as issuing in three broad streams—religious, social, and political. At many points, however, these streams run together and mix inseparably. It is inevitable that the quickening of native thought should manifest itself in all these main directions, and that in different minds a superior importance should be attached to one or other mode of manifestation. The middle position of the social movement, implicated, as it must be, with religion especially on the one side, and on the other in a less yet material degree with politics, furnishes it with a vantage ground, from which it must operate with commanding influence. Within that movement, if we mistake not, there have already germinated the strongest seeds of potency and promise in the modern transformation of Indian life and thought.

The Social Conference met with a record of seven years' work behind it. For a summary survey of that work Mr. Justice Ranade's address is of first-rate importance, and deserves the most careful study. Seven years are but a short epoch in the development of a national movement, and critics who look at a single meeting, as well as friends who are inconsiderately enthusiastic, are apt to take up depressing views of the progress of the cause. Mr. Justice Ranade, however, displayed a truer insight and judgment, and his address ought to prove highly encouraging. The fact is that Mr. Ranade is in the very centre, if not the head centre himself, of the social movement; and, therefore, it is not without an ample basis of facts that he bids his friends be of good courage. Thus, he first points to the Native States. "If the heart of the nation can be traced anywhere in its ancient strongholds," he says truly, "you will certainly seek it, strongly entrenched, in the Native States. If any movement stirs the Native States, which are impervious to your political and industrial propaganda, that is a sign that the heart of the nation has been touched." Mr. Ranade, then, is able to point to seventeen States in Rajputana as members of the Walter Krita Sabha, "whose annual reports show how strong is the organisation that has been set up in that province for the curtailment of extravagant expenditure on marriages and funerals and the regulation of child-marriages, not only among the Rajputs, but among many other castes allied to and subordinate to them." He points also to the work of social elevation promoted by the rulers of Baroda, Kashmir, and Cambay, and to the remarkable measures recently passed by the late Máháràja of Mysore in consultation with his Parliament. "The genuineness of the feeling," Mr. Ranade rightly judges, "is borne witness to by the fact that in inaugurating the new social regulations different methods of procedure have been adopted by different States to accomplish the same end. The method of direct legislation has found favour with Mysore, of caste initiation in Baroda, and of executive regulations in Rajputana." These are undoubtedly powerful indications of the spontaneous and indigenous origin of the movement. The interference of the British Government is a matter of extreme delicacy. It could more safely deal with such gross customs as suttee, infanticide, and hook-swinging; but it received a lesson of caution from the reception of the Age of Consent Act. While, however, its true policy is to leave the native mind to work out its own social reformation, it may often be able indirectly to extend opportune and judicious assistance to the spontaneous native desires for change. This it has happily done in various important cases, such as the new partition

law in Bengal, and the Malabar Marriage Bill at Madras. The essential spirit of the movement is also manifested in the fact that "the rulers of Baroda, Indore, Kapurthala, Bhaunagar, Morvi, Gondal, Vadhawan, Kooch Behar, Kohlapur, and many other States, have crossed the seas, and with large retinues, and some with their wives and children." But the movement is fundamentally popular; and this critically significant fact Mr. Ranade illustrated in ample detail.

The outcome of the new spirit in Indian life will be best appreciated from a glance at part of Mr. Justice Ranade's review. Among other points he cites these:

"The result of all this awakening is best seen in the keener appreciation of the moral law of purity and charity. This constitutes, in my view, the most instructive and hopeful feature of the past ten years. Even the Government has been forced to acknowledge the force of this new feeling. It is at the root of the agitation against vivisection, the Contagious Diseases Act, and the compulsory examination of women, in which last respect the Government here has had to yield to Indian and English public opinion. The same feeling also finds expression in the great Temperance agitation which has led to the appointment of two Commissions of inquiry. The agitation against the abuse of Temple endowments may be traced to the same source. The agitation against the nautch girl and loose habits of family life is explained by reform on the same principle. The movements intended to help the Pariah classes are due to the same potent cause. The miserable condition of the child-widow is now more keenly recognised as a problem which must be solved. Widows' homes are springing up in Allâhâbad, Calcutta, and Poona, and the question of the re-marriage of child-widows has passed the preliminary stage of a trial experiment. Polygamy and the sale of girls in marriage are also slowly disappearing from the land, though they will, I fear, fight hard to the end. More than seventy-five re-marriages have taken place in our Presidency, and twenty-five similar marriages during the last twenty years, and the cause has shown a steady rule of slow progress all over the country."

Measured, not by the standard of Western races, but by the conservative strength of Indian prejudices, and by the progress observable in Indian politics and Indian industries, the social advance of the past seven years is, beyond cavil, a very remarkable phenomenon. Its real significance lies in its inevitable future. It is an easy matter to sneer at the comparatively small muster of members at Madras, and to make a great deal of the occasionally discordant elements of opinion expressed there. But when one looks at the essential points of agreement, and remembers that simultaneous meetings with like purposes were being held in many other parts of the country, one finds material reasons to pause, and consider where this new spirit is likely to lead. Gradually the bonds of hereditary prejudice are being relaxed, and as they are relaxed the freer will India be to put her whole strength into the work of regeneration in every department of speculative and active life. The resolutions of the Social Conference dealt in a liberal spirit with many questions of far-reaching moment: the raising of the marriage age; the discouragement of nautch girl exhibitions (with arguments from the Argyll Rooms and the Empire Promenade); the placing of the enforcement of decrees for the restitution of conjugal rights in the discretion of the judges; the encouragement of the re-admission of foreign-travelled men into society; the extension of the practice of re-marriage, and the prevention of personal disfigurement of child-widows under certain caste rules; the promotion of temperance; the mitigation of racial dissensions on account of disputed customs and practices; the requirement of private morality in public men; the advancement of the higher education of women; and the proper administration of temple endowments. Not one of these objects but must be acknowledged to be highly laudable. The root difficulty, however, is the terrible ordeal of individual action in conformity with the principles of the social reformers. There is no ordeal in England to compare with it, and it is only men of exceptional strength of mind that can be expected to endure the social obloquy, and the wrenching of family and personal ties, that are supposed to be knotted with religious sanctions. The marvel is, not that the movement has made slow propress, but that it has ever achieved a real commencement. We in England honour and reverence the heroic men that sacrificed their all and their very lives in maintaining the cause of freedom of conscience. No less honour and reverence, as well as sympathy, our own history ought to teach us, is due to the heroic men that are now leading their less enlightened countrymen in India to burst the cruel bonds of enslaving and degrading customs.

A. F. Murison.

THE EXERCISE OF ARBITRARY POWER IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA.

By J. Dacosta.

"*Le gouvernement le plus parfait est celui où le pouvoir est le moins arbitraire.*"—Voltaire.

"*L'exécution de mauvaises lois est moins dangereuse que l'arbitraire. L'usage de l'arbitraire augmente sans relâche le besoin de l'arbitraire.*"—Lemontey.

The exercise of arbitrary power in the administration of India has increased of late years to a dangerous extent, sowing the seed of corruption and dissolution in every part of the governing body. The finances of the country are disorganised. The administration of justice is debased, tribunals controlled by the Executive being made to condone and sanction the illegal practices of fiscal officers. The Legislature, stripped of its highest attributes, and made to subserve the illegal purposes of the Government, has become degraded in the eyes of its own members, as well as in those of the people. The police, charged with executing the arbitrary behests of the authorities, are, by a constant extension of the sphere of their operations, afforded increased facilities for corrupt practices and extortion; and the army, which is kept on a war footing in time of peace, has, for eighteen years, been employed in inglorious and unjustifiable wars resulting in failure and humiliation.

That the above is a faithful outline of the state of things prevailing in India, there is no longer any room to doubt. The Indian Government is paying its way with borrowed money, and its only resource for staving off bankruptcy for a time appears to be a British guarantee for its loans—a guarantee which is to be asked for with the threat that its refusal

would cause the dissolution of the Empire. Such, at all events, is the financial situation indicated in the following statement of a semi-official organ published subsequently to the promulgation of the last Indian Budget, and the condition of the Indian Exchequer has nowise improved since then :—

"The most astonishing fact about the present situation is that the credit of the country for borrowing purposes keeps up as it does. The fact disguises what some writers in England have already recognised as the practical insolvency of India, which has actually set in. We are paying our way at home—as regards, amongst other charges, the interest on money borrowed—by borrowing more; and in view of the ghastly mess that the India Office has contrived to make of our affairs, there seems little prospect of being able to turn back within any reasonable future from the path on which we have thus entered. By degrees it must become perceptible that, no matter how exalted the morality of the Indian Government may be, there may come a time when it will not be able to act up to the principles on which till now its credit has reposed. New difficulties will then be found in placing, on such terms as we have been used to, loans that depend for their security on the resources of the Indian Government. Then will borrowing become possible only with the guarantee of the British Government, or, in other words, when the public at large is no longer willing to lend us funds with which to carry on, the Government of England will have to do that for us, or proclaim the dissolution of the Empire" (*Pioneer*, June 15, 1894).

Then, as regards the administration of justice, the decisions of the District Courts and subordinate tribunals have become a public scandal and a cause of consternation to the people. Private property is forcibly appropriated by the Government, and the District Courts, when appealed to for redress, decide without admissible evidence that the property belongs to the State. This statement would seem incredible, were it not supported by judgments delivered by the High Courts and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the comparatively small number of cases in which the victims had the means of appealing to those independent tribunals. Furthermore, innocent men have been sentenced to fines, whipping, imprisonment, hard labour or death, upon transparently false evidence concocted by the police; and when these nefarious proceedings have been exposed through an appeal to a High Court, the illegal conduct of the judge or officer implicated has been condoned by the Government on the unexplained and unaccountable ground that there is no reason to doubt the honourable motives which actuated the erring judge.

Lastly, as regards the army, there seems no justification in its being kept up on a war footing in time of peace, seeing that no enemy threatens the Indian frontier. The operations now carried on for the subjugation of the Waziris aptly illustrate, by their complete failure, the impracticable policy in the pursuit of which the Indian army is chiefly employed.

While reform is thus urgently needed in every department of the State, it is very powerfully resisted by the Secretary of State for India, who has acquired, through the sacrifice of Indian interests, the support of Parliament—the only constitutional authority to which he is amenable. Under such conditions the prospect of reform must seem very remote. Human affairs, however, are never stationary. In obedience to the laws of evolution, societies, like all organic bodies, are incessantly undergoing either healthy development and progress or retrogression and decay. To believe that a state of things such as now exists in India can continue without causing a disruption of the bonds which hold society together is simply to ignore the teachings of history. Communities are formed for the protection of life and property, and men willingly give up a portion of their natural rights in return for such protection. The compact implies honest zeal on the part of the rulers, and obedience and co-operation on the part of the people. History records, it is true, many instances in long-established monarchies of temporary misrule being condoned by the feeling of loyalty which previous reigns had engendered in the hearts of the subjects; but whenever reform became hopeless the people have not been slow in resuming their natural rights, and the suddenness of such resumption has often been a matter of general surprise.

James II. ascended, apparently without opposition, the throne of Great Britain in February, 1685. He violated the constitution of the realm, unauthorisedly levied customs, was at war with Parliament in order to obtain money, and demanded supplies to maintain a standing army. Before the expiration of three years James II. was a fugitive and a pensioner of the King of France.

In France events still more analogous to the present circumstances of British India occurred in the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI., and it was after a personal observation of those events that the two eminent writers formed the opinions regarding arbitrary power, which are quoted at the head of this article.

The arbitrary power exercised by Louis XV. led to profligate extravagance, oppressive taxation, and ultimately to the dispersion of the Parliament of Paris, which had refused to register his edicts for more money. The King, on being told of the ruin which threatened the country, replied that "the monarchy would last his time." He died shortly afterwards, and Louis XVI., who sincerely desired to improve the condition of his subjects, and was prepared for great personal sacrifices in the undertaking, unfortunately lacked the mental power of contending with the difficulties in the way. He restored the Parliament of Paris and proposed to abolish the most odious taxes, provided the privileged classes contributed to the revenue in the same proportion as the rest of the nation. This, however, the privileged classes refused to do. Meanwhile England was in the midst of her contest with the American colonies, and a passionate cry was raised in France for war with the English to avenge the loss of Canada. Louis XVI. was averse to that war; but he had to yield to the national movement, and the financial embarrassments of the French Treasury were considerably increased by that war.

A bold and ambitious Minister, Calonne, tried a new policy consisting in spending money on large public works calculated to give a grand idea of the national prosperity and sustain the public credit; but he soon confessed that, so long as the privileged classes did not bear a fair portion of the financial burden, he saw no means to cover the deficit, which then amounted to £7,600,000. His successor, M. Brienne, proposed to borrow £17,000,000 to meet immediate wants, but the Parliament of Paris

refused to register the necessary edict, saying that the matter was in the province of the States-General, an elective body through which in previous times the interests of every province were constitutionally represented to the King. That body had, however, not been convoked for many years, because its functions militated with the arbitrary power assumed by the sovereign. Louis XVI. was then ill-advised enough to enforce the registration in the Parliament of Paris of certain edicts creating the *Cour Plénière* and a judicial tribunal, which superseded almost entirely the functions of the Parliament of Paris. The Provincial Parliaments at once manifested their sympathy with the Parliament of the metropolis by suspending their sittings; and public meetings were held in many parts of the kingdom where oaths were taken to oppose the innovations of the Crown. Serious disturbances followed; all classes clamoured for the meeting of the States-General; and the King, feeling the struggle to be hopeless, convoked that body for the month of May, 1789. It was arranged that one half of its members should belong to the privileged classes—the noblesse, the clergy, and the tiers-état—and that the other half should consist of *roturiers*, or non-privileged persons. In all other respects, however, the arrangements were sadly deficient. Scarcely any limit was imposed regarding suffrage, and no provision was made as to the deliberations being separate or collective.

The people were greatly excited; a kind of political millennium was expected from the proposed system of parliamentary or representative government. The elections nevertheless went off quietly; and, at the opening ceremony, the King's speech was listened to with respect. No one at that meeting could have imagined that a great revolution, the abolition of royalty, the dispersion of the privileged classes and wholesale massacres were soon to follow.

The reader will doubtless have observed a remarkable similarity between the events in France, which preceded the convocation of the States-general, and the events in India which followed the introduction, in 1858, of the present system of administration controlled by a member of the British Cabinet. The similarity, however, is quite intelligible, seeing that the causes, which operated in the two countries during the periods referred to, were essentially identical. The financial embarrassments in both countries, brought about by the extravagance of the rulers, had led to oppressive taxation and popular suffering and discontent. (*See Lord Mayo's Budget Speech*, 1870.) In both countries the difficulties of the Exchequer were aggravated by useless wars and inordinate expenditure on public works; and in both countries also the voice of the people was silenced through a resort to arbitrary power by the head of the State. Ultimately in France the evil assumed so acute and threatening a character that, when the empirical remedies applied proved unavailing, the Government resolved to consult the people as to the best way to deal with difficulties which both the people and the Government were deeply interested in surmounting. In India at present the difficulties are likewise increasing, and all the empirical remedies hitherto tried have proved utterly ineffectual. It becomes interesting, therefore, and of practical importance for our guidance in India, to inquire why the popular step taken in France for the solution of her difficulties, failed to arrest the downward course of her affairs. History ascribes the failure to the following causes. The States-general had not previously been a legislative body, and lacked, therefore, the stringent rules which are indispensable for the freedom of deliberation in a popular assembly. Hence the new assembly was unfitted for the performance of the high functions which it was suddenly called to undertake. No principle had even been fixed for apportioning among the three sections of the assembly—the noblesse, the clergy, and the tiers-état—the degree of influence that each was legitimately entitled to exercise over its decisions. Meanwhile the sufferings and irritation of the people and the difficulties and anxieties of the Government were increasing daily; and, in the midst of the disturbances and the angry passions which raged at the time, it became impossible to redeem and remedy the fatal errors and omissions that had been committed in the hurried constitution of the assembly.

The time may come when Parliamentary or representative institutions will be deemed suitable for the administration of India; and considering that no practical suggestion has come from any quarter for affording her the relief which she even now so urgently needs, it can scarcely be deemed premature to discuss how representative institutions, which have proved beneficial in every part of the globe where they have been introduced, could best be adapted to the requirements of our great dependency.

J. DACOSTA.

INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

LUNCHEON TO MR. A. WEBB, M.P.

IMPORTANT GATHERING AT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB.

MR. ALFRED WEBB, M.P., who recently returned from India, where he presided over the Tenth Indian National Congress at Madras, was entertained at luncheon at the National Liberal Club, on February 18th, "by a few of his friends who are interested in the welfare" of India. The Right Hon. James Stansfeld, M.P., presided, and among the gentlemen present were Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Mr. George Russell, M.P., Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., Sir W. Lawson, M.P., Mr. John Dillon, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P., Mr. P. J. Power, M.P., Mr. W. Crosfield, M.P., Mr. S. Young, M.P., Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien, M.P., Sir J. Leng, M.P., Mr. H. C. F. Luttrell, M.P., Mr. Bodkin, M.P., Mr. J. Wilson, M.P., Mr. Swift McNeil, M.P., Mr. H. Roberts, M.P., Sir W. W. Hunter, Mr. A. E. Fletcher, Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D., Mr. C. Hancock, Mr. A. G. Symonds, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. William Digby, Mr. Parbati C. Roy, Mr. Gordon Hewart, Mr. Kabiruddin Kazi, Mr. A. M. K. Dehlan, Mr. J. V. Desai, Mr. S. J. Meerza, Mr. H. Mullick, Mr. J. M. Nair, Mr. K. A. Ghaswalla, Mr. M. A. Ghain, Mr. Gopal Singh, Mr. H. N. Haridas, Mr. M. H. Nazar, and Mr. Pestonji.

After luncheon,

MR. STANSFELD said: The first toast I have to propose is that of the Queen of the United Kingdom and the Empress of India. (Cheers.) We can say of our sovereign that she has been the very model of a constitutional sovereign, and I do not believe that history affords an example of a more truly

constitutional, a more sympathetic, or a more beloved one than the Queen who sits upon the throne of the United Kingdom. (Cheers.) She is also the Empress of India. I do not lay stress upon that title, but I am glad to believe, and indeed I may say to know, that she is regarded with reverence and affection by the vast native population of our great dependency. (Hear, hear.) They know what her sympathy has always been for those who suffer, for those who are poor, who need help, who need lifting up in the world in which we live; and, if I mistake not, in that great National Congress at Madras over which our friend Mr. Alfred Webb presided there were conclusive evidences of genuine loyalty and personal sympathy, respect, and affection on the part of the vast Indian population for the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and the Empress of India. I give you, therefore, the health of the Queen, and God bless her. (Cheers.)

The toast was drunk with cordiality.

The CHAIRMAN: I have now to announce that letters of regret for inability to attend have been received from Mr. Gilbert Beith, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. Dalziel, M.P., Mr. S. Digby, Mr. Michael Davitt, Mr. Lucy, Captain Cecil Norton, M.P., Mr. H. Paul, M.P., Sir Henry Roscoe, M.P., Sir Bernhard Samuelson, M.P., Mr. Wason, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., Mr. C. P. Scott, Mr. Spicer, M.P., and Mr. Schwann, M.P. Mr. Bayley, M.P., is too unwell to be with us. Sir J. Pease, M.P., promised to attend if he could possibly reach town in time. Mr. E. Blake, M.P., writes expressing deep regret that he cannot attend. Mr. Schwann is unfortunately laid up with influenza. Mr. Michael Davitt's letter contains the following:—"I am sorry I cannot stay long enough in London to attend the luncheon which the friends of India are to give to Mr. Alfred Webb. All Irish Home Rulers are naturally proud of the part which Mr. Webb has played at the recent National Congress at Madras. As we are all friends of India, we are all rejoiced to know that our distinguished countryman has rendered signal service to the national cause in India by his able and unanswerable addresses in support of the principles and programme of the Congress." (Loud cheers). It is now my privilege, continued Mr. Stansfeld, to propose to you on this occasion the health of our friend Mr. Webb, and to extend to him an expression of our hearty welcome on his return to this country after fulfilling, with much distinction, ability, and success, his duties as chairman of the tenth National Congress of India. I have read Mr. Webb's opening and concluding addresses as well as something of the proceedings of the Congress and the resolutions passed by it. I do not propose now to dwell upon the latter: this is not the fitting time. But I may refer to Mr. Webb's addresses because we are to-day concerned with him. Of course I assume that almost everybody here has read those addresses. But I may take leave to say that they are distinguished by characteristically clear views from a high standpoint by sympathy with other subject races not unnatural in an Irishman—(cheers)—by justice to their rulers, not always so easy, by charity to all and by counsels of moderation, mutual forbearance and trust. (Hear, hear.) With your leave I may make a quotation or two. Speaking of the exceptional duties in the face of Indian reformers and in view of the vast and varied populations of Indians untrained in political life and unused to self-government, Mr. Webb told his hearers that this gave rise to the greater necessity "that a deaf ear should be turned to the doctrines of despair." That is a lesson which all of us may with advantage study. (Hear, hear.) Lessons of despair are never to be trusted or accepted. Nothing good is obtained in this world by those who despair. Truth is based upon hope and hope leads to the realization of that which is truth. Then Mr. Webb went on to say:—"Yet it is necessary to bear in mind that the period of wakening of the subject peoples is a critical time, before habits of self-restraint and sentiments of responsibility have been acquired, and that mistakes are certain to be made. It is needful therefore to take heed that in the leading of these peoples there should be no just ground of accusation." What could exceed the kindly wisdom of these words? And what must have been the gratification of Mr. Webb to feel in what a spirit of sympathetic acceptance they were received by the native population which he addressed? (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen there are two sides to Mr. Webb's remarks, and to my mind they show a great comprehensiveness of view from a high standpoint as well as practical judgment of detail. The strength of the man who can see both sides, and yet take his own, is a strength which in Mr. Webb's case may to some minds have been disguised by the charm of gentleness—by the gentle persuasiveness of the man. (Hear, hear.) In speaking of India being ruled by Englishmen Mr. Webb does not mark time. He does not say that "though I speak for the native population I wish to take a moderate view and I wish to admit that you as rulers have some merits," but he starts from another point altogether, and he takes a distinct but not inconsistent view which itself is an evidence of reliable strength in any man. He says:—"Never has more conscience been brought to the government of a conquered people." I can understand that some people—many natives as well as English people—will say that there have been no infrequent occasions where there was a want of conscience in the government of India by the English people. (Hear, hear.) That of course is one of the dangers of conquest and despotism, but I believe that the sense of responsibility amongst the English governing classes in the management of the Indian people has led to a better, although a despotic, government than could well have been foreseen. I do not suppose that the history of the world shows a less unfavourable example. Again, speaking of certain defects in criminal procedure, Mr. Webb goes on to say that "as it is the desire of everybody engaged in the government of India to secure impartiality, they would all try their best to remove those defects." I suppose it is admitted that the English people have no more absolutely positive idea than that of the impartial administration of criminal justice. Mr. Webb in his parting address said—"I adhere to all I said regarding the general character of the British Government in India, I adhere to all I wrote concerning the general character of the Indian Civil Service. There has never been any service to equal it." These words were received with approval, and I venture to say that to see this clearly is evidence of judgment, force, and impartiality which ought to compel the respect of Indians and Anglo-Indians here and in India, and of those who have joined us to pay respect to the gentleman who occupied the presidential chair at the late Congress. (Cheers.) Time will not allow me to go into further details or into the evidence of the Press as to the effect produced by Mr. Webb's address on the native and the Anglo-Indian population. But I have here a summary of communications received in England by the British Committee—communications from scores of men of all classes and creeds resident in different provinces and testifying to the admiration and affection which Mr. Webb excited in the minds of all who were brought into contact with him by his wise and sympathetic manner, in the discharges of the duties of the onerous and responsible position which he occupied. (Hear.) I say this because even the Anglo-Indian press, which is most bitterly opposed to the Congress movement, has in no inconsiderable part joined in the chorus of praise, and has alluded to the moderation of Mr. Webb's addresses. I will now sum up in the fewest possible words the conclusions which we are entitled to draw from the facts I have so rapidly brought under your notice. I submit we are entitled to say to all the world of our friend, that he gave wise, moderate and prudent counsels; that his hearers received his counsels favourably; that he showed his appreciation of our civilizing mission in India; and I say, in conclusion, that he did at one and the same time a service which we will take future opportunities of proclaiming, alike to India and to the country from which he came. (Loud cheers.) I beg to propose "Welcome and health to our friend Mr. Alfred Webb." (Renewed cheering.)

The toast was drunk with great enthusiasm.

Mr. WEBB, who was greeted with loud cheers, said in reply: Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Naoroji, Sir William Wedderburn, and Gentlemen,—It would be impossible that I should not feel in the highest degree gratified and flattered by this most kind reception from so many whose good esteem I value, and at the terms in which you, Mr. Stansfeld, have proposed my health. I accept it mainly as due to the high and honourable post that I have just had the privilege of holding, as President of the Indian National Congress. (Hear, hear.) In so far as there may seem to be any personal credit, it is not so much on account of anything I myself accomplished as because of the environment in which I found myself in India, the perfect arrangements for and organisation of the Congress, the reasonable and statesmanlike treatment of the subjects which came up for discussion, and the never failing support of able coadjutors. (Hear, hear.) If at Madras I had found inadequate preparations or

disorganisation no poor efforts on my part could have availed to make the Congress a success. In truth, gentlemen, I have come back humbled rather than elated—humbled to think what a small portion of my attention has hitherto been given to the interests of three hundred millions of our fellow subjects, not elated when I remember how little the success of the Congress was due to my own puny efforts. This call to India was a complete surprise. Being, however, a soldier in politics, and realising the honour done to Ireland by the invitation, I felt that wiser men than myself had assigned to me an honourable task which I dare not refuse, and that all that remained for me was to do my best in the position in which I was placed. (Hear, hear.) If the friends of the Congress here and in India are in any degree satisfied with the way in which I fulfilled my trust they have largely to thank the unprepared and diffident state of mind in which I undertook it. There is something in the point of view of the eminent Irish ecclesiastic and patriot, who, having watched the breakdown and humbled retirement of one who had too confidently ascended the orator's chair, said to him: "If you had gone up as you went down, you would have come down as you went up." (Laughter.) It has been one of the greatest privileges of my life to have been permitted to pay this visit to India, and to have shared for ever so short a time the aspirations and sympathies that animate the more enlightened of our fellow subjects in that distant land. (Hear, hear.) To move amongst these men and to look into their faces was to me to learn to love them with a real brotherly affection. They are, to be sure, human and, like ourselves, have faults, and if these faults differ in form from our own there are many reasons why it should be so. The history of the men of India has been different from ours, their ideas and cast of thought are different, as are the circumstances in which they find themselves. (Hear, hear.) It is as yet impossible to realize the general condition of society towards which their evolution tends—towards what they are consciously working or being unconsciously impelled. (Hear, hear.) In all the essential elements of our nature we are, however, closely allied. Not only, as in the words of Carlyle: "All men are to an unspeakable degree brothers, and each man's life a strange emblem of every man's"; but are not our race and that of the people of India still more closely allied by the fact that both are branches of the same great Aryan race? (Hear, hear.) I was, while in India, upon more than one occasion profoundly affected by realising this fact from the songs of the people. The Indian mothers, for instance, lull their children to sleep with the same cadences which are to be heard in the nurseries and cabins of my own country. (Hear, hear.) And many of the ancient Vedic hymns sounded to my ears like far off echoes of the chants one has been accustomed to hear in our Christian minsters. (Hear, hear.) There may be great differences between the nations. Yet I am satisfied that if we desire happiness and contentment in India we must apply there the same general principles of government as are called for here. (Cheers.) And if it is acknowledged, as is now generally admitted, that the neglect of those principles in the past (as, for instance, in Ireland) has led to most grievous consequences, it is desirable that no repetition of such mistakes should occur with regard to India. (Hear, hear.) If real sympathy with, and respect for, the governed is necessary in the British Isles it is equally necessary in the Indian Empire, where alas! a contrary spirit at present shown by the dominant race too often makes one blush for one's fellow-countrymen. (Cheers.) Here in the United Kingdom it is now universally admitted that representation is an essential part of the enlightened government of every class of the community, and that no man or party of men, however wise and well-intentioned, dare hope to govern others properly without the assistance of freely chosen representatives of the governed. (Cheers.) Does not the same hold good for India? Here no Civil Service, no constituted authority however pure and high-minded, could safely be permitted to dictate as to principles of government and proceeding. (Hear, hear.) Is it not doubly unsafe to give this permission there? (Hear, hear.) If, in the midst of our comparatively homogeneous society, we feel that the needs of the Irish tenant, the artisan, the labourer, and in short all classes of the community were not properly understood until each class was directly represented in Parliament, how can we expect to act fairly towards the mixed millions of India until their voices also are fully heard in Council either here or within her own borders? (Cheers.) At the present moment these considerations press urgently. We are in a certain sense at the parting of the ways. (Hear, hear.) Opposition from the ancient rulers of the country is finally disposed of. Theirs was in many respects an unfair rule, but it was at least the outcome of the history of the Indian nations, and moulded upon the prejudices and most urgent wants of the people. We, with another history and different prejudices, are now face to face with the problem of the government of the masses of India. Is there not considerable danger that we may blindly press too far and be over-active in wrong directions? (Cheers.) Schools and colleges are doing their work. (Hear, hear.) Everywhere I found that the history of this country was made a subject of study, and the politics of our islands were discussed. The intelligent classes of India, reading and studying this history and these politics, are no more likely than our own people to remain satisfied to be like clay in the hands of the potter. (Cheers.) They are demanding, and will increasingly demand, a share in the government of their own country. This being so, the Congress movement is on every account to be encouraged. One was impressed by the reasonableness of the views expressed both at its meetings and in the conversation of its leaders and representatives. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that its aims are narrow and sectional, or that its members have not at heart the interest of the masses of their people. (Hear, hear.) Through this movement alone can we at present be best made aware of the wants and wishes of India. (Cheers.) It would be as unwise for England to condemn or seek to discourage these gatherings as it would be for mariners to object to buoys and beacons being set upon sunken rocks and reefs. Whether through the Congress or otherwise, the financial condition of India will necessarily force itself more and more upon our attention. (Hear, hear.) The Indian import duties are the necessary consequence of increased expenditure, and the dissatisfaction in Lancashire is the result of those import duties. The strongest condemnation of that reckless expenditure, against which Indian representatives have for years protested, now that the shoe pinches comes from Lancashire. I refer to the opinions circulated within the last few days in a pamphlet by a director of the Blackburn Chamber of Commerce. Our business round this table is with the affairs of India, her needs and difficulties; but as an Irishman my mind naturally turns also towards the present and future of my own country. (Hear, hear.) You, gentlemen, are friends of Ireland; all kindly disposed towards her, many entirely devoted to her service. Will you allow me to draw a parallel between the two countries, which, while in India, has often forced itself upon me? And will you further forgive me if before concluding I venture to point a moral? As President of the Congress I was greatly impressed, as all through my life in Ireland, with the wealth of intellectual sagacity and devotion which, instead of being made use of for the good of the nations and the empire, lies fallow and unused. In Great Britain and her self-governing colonies this intellectual wealth is freely expended for the good of the community, while in Ireland and in India it is forced into private channels or distilled into bitterness. (Hear, hear.) This narrowing in of the intellectual force and devotion of Irishmen and of the natives of India, as well as of every country whose government is external to it, will continue to be a serious loss and drain until through self-government—it may be in very different forms and under very different limitations—the national forces are gathered up and utilised in a natural and wholesome manner. (Loud cheers.) When, in due time, the intellect and devotion of the people of India and of Ireland are drawn out by responsibility and utilised in the same way as are the voluntary services of Englishmen in England and of the colonists in the self-governing colonies, great will be the gain in wealth, power, and contentment not only to India and to Ireland, but also to the British Empire as a whole. And now, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Naoroji, Sir William Wedderburn, and Gentlemen, it only remains for me to thank you for your kind reception and patient hearing, and to assure you that my services as President of the Tenth Indian National Congress have given me some of the richest and most interesting experiences of my life. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. George Russell, M.P.: Mr. Webb has just told us, in the course of his interesting address, an excellent story about an orator who mounted the oratorical rostrum in one mood and came down in another. I rise in the spirit in which that orator came down, for I am quite as conscious as any of my hearers can be of my great unworthiness to follow, even at a respectful distance, a speaker who has had, like Mr. Webb, such unique opportunities of observing the present condition of affairs

in India, and of appreciating native sentiment. Mr. Stansfeld, you are aware that we were at one time rather closely associated in Indian business. You are also aware that my interest in all that concerns the moral and political well-being of India has been a very keen one, and, without entering into controversial matters, I think I may confidently make an appeal to your recollection in that regard. It certainly was by no choice of my own that I ceased to be officially associated with the fortunes of India. (Hear.) But in politics, as in cricket, if on being ordered by your captain to change your place in the field, you sulk and refuse to play, or beat the captain about the head with a stump, your side is probably foredoomed to failure. During the time I held the post in the House of Commons to which I have referred, it may well have appeared to some of you—either to natives or to sympathisers with India—that, in what I was able to do, my performances fell short of my professions. It is in truth only too easy for a man in my position to be ground to powder between the upper and the nether millstone—the upper millstone of official discipline, the nether millstone of national aspiration. But I should like to read to you a few words contained in a letter I received from a personal friend after I was transferred to another office. The writer says:—"I shall now await with interest the time when you will come back as Secretary of State, with Mr. Herbert Paul as Under-Secretary, and triumphantly abolish the opium traffic, establish not one but many simultaneous examinations for everything, inflict penal servitude for breaches of the new cantonment rules, and appoint a Royal Commission of Natives to overhaul our finances. (Laughter.) These things I shall not approve, but, even at that price, I shall be glad to have you here again, and you may rely on my loyal co-operation." In these words of gloomy official forecast you may perhaps read some evidence of the policy which would have been mine had I been in a position to give effect to my desires. (Hear, hear.) You will make, I am sure, proper allowance for the exaggeration of official pessimism, but, roughly speaking and in general terms, these words from my official friend in the India Office do not inexactly represent my sentiments with respect to India—sentiments which, whether in the capacity of an official servant of India, or as an unofficial member of Parliament, will always command my sympathy and my best practical efforts. (Cheers.)

Sir WILLIAM HUNTER: It is a surprise to me that I should be asked to speak on this occasion. But it is also a pleasure. For I see around me men who have been for ten years associated in trying to secure the progress of India, and at this table there is one gentleman who with myself belongs to that class of whom Mr. Webb has spoken in modified terms of admiration. Sir William Wedderburn—(hear)—and I were the two civilians who, ten years ago, lifted our voices to welcome the movement which has become the Indian National Congress, and, gentlemen, as life goes on, although we may sometimes diverge in our opinions as to the road of progress, there is no man who, in his own humble sphere of activity, is more desirous than myself to promote the progress of the Indian race. India is a bond among many men in England who differ widely as to home politics. I may perhaps be considered rather as an example to be avoided than as a pattern to be copied, but I wish it to be understood that, whatever a man's opinions may be about English affairs, if he really understands India his heart is with Indian progress. The guidance of that progress is the greatest duty which England has in hand at present. All other questions, even the Irish question, the question of the House of Lords, and domestic questions are really as nothing in the long run compared with the question as to how we are to discharge our duty to our Indian Empire. (Hear, hear.) If I may say so, Mr. Chairman, I regretted to hear the words "subject races" applied to our fellow-subjects in India. It is a most misleading expression. (Hear, hear.) We have heard from Mr. Webb something about previous dynasties in India and, if I were asked as an historical student to discriminate between the dynasties of India in the past and the dynasty of India at present, I should say that the great difference lies in the fact that the previous Indian dynasties have regarded the larger portion of the Indian population as subject races, whereas we regard them as fellow subjects. (Cheers.) We have our Magna Charta for England. There was often difficulty in construing it, for it belonged to a period long gone past. But India, too, has a Magna Charta of her own. It bears the name of the sovereign still reigning—it is Her Majesty's Proclamation of 1858. That is a Magna Charta the interpretation of which admits of no difficulty. It is a Magna Charta which proclaims the equality of all the people and of all the races of India in the sight of the law and as our fellow-subjects of the Queen. It was with much instruction and pleasure that I read the speeches of Mr. Webb to the Congress. I believe you will find that the future progress of India will be rapid in proportion as the demands made by the friends of India are moderate. We should never forget that exaggeration frightens the English public. We have to deal not alone with what is fit and proper for India, but also with the fears and apprehensions of the English people lest Great Britain should lose India, and everything which savours of exaggeration, whether in the Congress or on the platform, tends to retard legitimate progress. I speak as one who sincerely and heartily desires to see accomplished the general programme of the Congress, and as one who believes that that accomplishment will be realised in this present century. (Cheers.)

Mr. JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M.P.: I am sure I need hardly say how pleased and how proud I feel to be present on this occasion. I feel pleased and proud in being able to join in this mark of respect to my esteemed friend Mr. Webb—a mark of respect and gratitude for the admirable and statesmanlike part which he played in presiding over the great Indian Congress. (Hear, hear.) These Congresses are amongst the great events of our day. They show us—I might almost say, automatically—in what direction the future Government of India is to take its course. I need hardly say that Ireland—Nationalist Ireland—(hear, hear)—has always been in thorough sympathy with the aspirations of the people of India. For myself, I am glad to be able to say that I never spoke a word or wrote a line about India—and I have spoken many words and written many lines on that subject—that were not in the fullest and deepest sympathy with that cause which is represented by the great Congress held the other day. I feel pride, too, when I remember that it was an Irishman—perhaps the greatest of Irishmen—Edmund Burke who first endeavoured to arouse in this country a generous sympathy with the races of India. (Cheers.) I specially admire in Mr. Webb's addresses that spirit of moderation, and that spirit of genuine sympathy, which led him to make allowance not only for the feelings of the people but even for the men who, both here and in India, have to govern them. (Hear, hear.) The occasion was one which might perhaps have offered a temptation to exaggeration, or might at least have tempted a display of mere rhetoric. But Mr. Webb showed the moderation and sagacity of a genuine statesman in every sentence of every address that he delivered during his stay in India. I am glad to be able to welcome him back, and to take my part, however small, in a celebration such as this. I think that we in this country are learning much from the people of India as to the way in which India must be governed, and not only that, but also as to the way in which countries nearer home must be governed. I cannot forget that Mr. Webb has borne a very important part in another great fight, and that he has long and consistently advocated the cause of Ireland, and I am therefore all the more delighted to say a few words on such an occasion as this. (Hear, hear.)

Sir WILFRED LAWSON, M.P.: I am afraid that I cannot throw any light on the Indian question, for I do not profess to be an Indian expert. I find English politics quite as much, and indeed rather more than, I can understand. (Laughter.) But I was very glad to have the kind invitation to come here to-day. I see so many of my friends around me, especially my friend your chairman. We have all watched his political career, and, so far as I can read his conduct, I think it has been based on the motto of Mr. Burke, that a thing which is morally wrong can never be politically right. I was sorry to see the remarks of Mr. Stansfeld in which he indicated that he was going to retire from political life because it was time to give way to younger men. I do not see why he should do that. (Hear, hear.) There is an old saying that there is no fool like an old fool. (Laughter.) I am not applying that to the chairman, but I am going to say this, that there is no reformer like an old reformer—(cheers)—and if a man, through a long number of years, has retained his old Liberalism he must have the root of the matter in him. I have met many so-called old Liberals who are Tories in reality, and therefore I feel we cannot afford to lose a Liberal like Mr. Stansfeld. I do trust that he will reconsider his determination, and be with us in the many fights which are looming in the not very distant future. (Cheers.) I am glad to meet, too, Mr. Webb. I

have only known him well since he came into the House of Commons. I know him as a great fighter for the emancipation of Ireland, and I hope his efforts for the emancipation of that country as well as for that of India will in due time meet with success. He has given us many interesting reminiscences of India, and, when he told us of Indian women singing Irish songs to their children, I thought it would be well worth one's while to go to India to hear the Indian women sing "Kathleen Mavourneen" and "Erin-go-Bragh." (Loud laughter.) I am glad to meet here another friend in Mr. George Russell, who has a very difficult part to play in trying to be at one and the same time an official and a reformer. Most people break down when they try that, but I have great faith in him, because I believe that the official is only external, and that the reformer lies deep in his heart. (Cheers.) I am sure he will remember what Mr. Webb said, that in India at least it had been discovered that there was conscience in the government of a conquered people. I wish there was conscience in the government of all people, whether conquered or not. (Hear, hear.) I wish we had a little more conscience in the government of Ireland by England. (Hear, hear.) We know that conscience in the Government of a country can only be ensured by extending the freedom of that country, wherever it may be. We must always remember what our great leader, Mr. Gladstone, said when someone asked him what thing he had learned most deeply in his long life. He said he had learnt that freedom was a good thing in itself. (Cheers.) And so it is. It is a great thing in itself for every country. I think all we here to-day are friends of freedom not only in India but also in Ireland, and all the world over. (Hear, hear.) We believe that a sensible, rational, safe extension of self-government is the best security for the peace, honour, and glory of all nations. I have had sent me a copy of a poem which was written about a hundred years ago on the subject of English liberty. It describes how England, for generations and centuries, struggled for liberty, and, after expressing a wish that that liberty may be extended through the whole world, it concludes:

"Whate'er their tongue,
Whate'er their hue,
Whate'er the course they may pursue,
Or clime which gave them birth,
Oh, Liberty, may'st thou be given
As bounteous as the light of Heaven
To all the sons of Earth."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P.: I am very much obliged to the chairman for calling upon me to say a few words. My whole desire in being here to-day was to hear some sympathetic and generous words from our English and Irish sympathisers. These we have had, and, as far as I am concerned, I feel exceedingly gratified with these words. (Hear, hear.) They were words of encouragement and of good advice, and, as far as lies in our power, we shall treasure that advice and try our best to move in the lines of moderation which have been specially recommended to us. (Hear, hear.) One thing is exceedingly satisfactory to me, and that is that we have the testimony of Mr. Webb himself, after his personal experience in presiding over the National Congress, that the proceedings were conducted on reasonable and moderate lines. (Cheers.) That testimony is more valuable to me than anything else, and I assure him on behalf of those who are here present, whether they be Muhammadans, Hindus, or Parsis, that we tender him our sincere thanks and our great gratitude for the manner in which he has fulfilled the mission entrusted to him. When, with the help of Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Blake, and Mr. O'Brien, we selected Mr. Webb to go to India I had not the slightest misgiving as to whether the mission would be a perfect success, for the simple reason that I had come into contact with our guest on many occasions, I had carefully watched his career, and I had satisfied myself that with a calm judicial head he united a sympathetic heart. Knowing this as I did perfectly well, I felt confident that he would be a great accession to the Congress, that he would go there in a sympathetic spirit, and that he would feel the greatest sense of responsibility in undertaking a very difficult and onerous task. (Hear, hear.) My views have been more than fully realised. (Hear, hear.) He has done us a great service. He has shown that the whole object of the Congress was to support British rule and to bring that rule into lines tending to great reforms. (Cheers.) I believe that both our English and our Indian rulers will profit thereby. (Cheers.) On behalf of my countrymen here present I beg to thank our friends for their attendance on this occasion, and for the kind and encouraging words they have addressed to us. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P.: I had the honour and pleasure of being present at the National Congress at Madras, and I testify to the onerous nature of the task which Mr. Webb fulfilled. In the first place there was an audience of something like 10,000 persons; and in the next place the business for each day necessitated the preparation beforehand of an enormous mass of detail. Mr. Webb was thus occupied from twelve to fourteen hours a day, and that in itself was sufficient to have broken down his health. I had the pleasure of sitting at his right hand during the Congress and sometimes had occasion to warn him of the dangers he ran from undue exposure to the Indian sun. The English press in India are bitterly opposed as a whole to the Congress movement, and the prudence and moderation displayed by Mr. Webb in his opening and closing addresses was one of the things which most irritated that press. I noticed in the *Times of India* a leading article headed "Balaam at Madras," in which the writer said an Irish member had been sent over for the purpose of cursing the Government of India but had turned round and blessed it. I may be wrong in saying so, but I think the passion shown in the leading columns of the leading Anglo-Indian press almost amounted to hatred of the native races of India, and they showed, too, something like hatred for those Europeans who had adopted the cause of India. They treated them as if they were nothing b t mere agitators who had come forward to teach the natives that they actually had rights. That was the gravamen of the charge levelled against them. In conclusion, I will only say I trust that the connection which the Irish Parliamentary party have strengthened by sending one of their number to preside over the tenth National Congress of India will continue to grow in strength, and I hope it will lead to an increased attendance on their part when Indian topics are debated in the present and future Sessions of Parliament. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P.: I have no speech to make to-day, and if I had I should be afraid to make it in the presence of gentlemen so well acquainted with Indian affairs. But this I will say, that I do not think there is any one present who sympathises more deeply with the natives of India than I do. (Hear, hear.) Such attention as I have been able to give to Indian matters, and the observations I was able to make a year ago during a comparatively short visit to India, have not enabled me to teach anybody, but have filled me with perplexity as to the almost overwhelming problems to be solved in that country. (Hear, hear.) I am, however, very glad to be here to-day to join with others in bearing my testimony to the efforts of our friend Mr. Alfred Webb and to the manner in which he discharged the duties devolving upon him at Madras. It is interesting to notice in these countries that there are men who have not made themselves widely known or notorious, but who, when they are singled out by their friends for a position of this kind,—a position of the utmost difficulty and responsibility—are able at once to come forward and discharge the duties as admirably as Mr. Webb has done on this occasion. (Hear, hear.) We are glad, too, to be under the presidency of Mr. Stansfeld this morning. I know, and we all know, how during his long career he has been a firm and steadfast friend to nationalities, and how he has himself suffered for his adherence to principle, moral as well as political. (Cheers.)

Mr. A. E. Fletcher: I think the remarks uttered by Mr. Seymour Keay do not apply to the press in this country, for several newspapers have endeavoured to enlighten English people in this country on Indian affairs. I was very much struck with the observations of Sir William Hunter with regard to the objection to styling the Indian people as "subject races." How can they be subject races when you are so much afraid of them that you have to keep them down by perhaps the most costly military system the world has ever known. I think you will never solve Indian problems until you carry out the true Imperial idea that empires, like individuals, should learn not to be envied and feared, but to be trusted and loved. We shall never be entitled to call ourselves masters of India until we have recognised the fact that the greatness of a nation depends, not upon a policy of buffer states or upon the demarcation of scientific frontiers, but upon acting in co-operation with the people themselves, and getting the flower of their manhood to act with our own officials. You will

never be entitled to call yourselves masters of India until you have given Home Rule to India—(hear)—until you have won the hearts of the Indian people, and legislated for them on the lines to which the distinguished men who have associated themselves with this movement have given a lifetime of energy and devotion. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, M.P.: You will see from the toast-list, that I have the privilege and pleasure of proposing the health of the Chairman. I think that we have been peculiarly fortunate in obtaining to-day the presence of Mr. Stansfeld as our Chairman. (Hear, hear.) The object that we have at heart is to draw the people of India nearer to us, and to do so in a way that will promote their best and truest interests. (Hear, hear.) Our desire is that our relations with India should be those of strict justice, and that we should promote her material interest. But beyond that we desire that our rule should be cordially sympathetic towards the people of India. (Cheers.) We also desire always to keep before our eyes the highest ideal of duty, and of moral rectitude; and such being our aims and objects I am sure that we could not have a more fitting representative than our Chairman, Mr. Stansfeld, because, as has already been remarked, during his long, honourable and unselfish career, he has always shown a generous sympathy for national aspirations, and he has also shown a resolute determination to uphold the highest moral standard in all things, whether social or political. (Cheers.) India, gentlemen, during past years and within our own memory has had in the House of Commons such powerful friends as Richard Cobden, John Bright, Henry Fawcett, and Charles Bradlaugh. (Cheers.) There were giants in those days. Mr. Stansfeld belongs rather to their generation than to the generation of newer and younger men, to whom I am sorry to see he is prepared to hand over the duties of the future. I am much afraid that very few of these younger men will be found to come up to the standard of the men I have named. But, if we have no heroic strength, we must try to cultivate in ourselves an heroic heart, so that we may say in the words of Ulysses that though

> "We are not now that strength which in old days
> Moved earth and heaven, that which we are, we are;
> One equal temper of heroic hearts,
> Made weak by time and fate but strong in will
> To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

If we feel painfully the individual weakness of the friends of India compared with former friends of India, we must remember that in these latter days strength comes in great measure from combination and co-operation. Victory belongs rather to big battalions than to single heroes. Therefore, we have been anxious to form in the House of Commons an Indian party who will do their best by combined action to make up for the individual weakness of those who desire the welfare of India. (Cheers.) That is a scheme which we have tried to bring forward in an Indian Parliamentary Committee. And there is a new source from which we gain additional strength at the present time. Public opinion in India within the last ten years has become consolidated and organised, and is able now to give a clearer voice to its views through the Indian National Congress, and our great object has been to bring these forces together—to associate the Indian Parliamentary party with the Indian National Congress, and to get them to co-operate. In that sense Mr. Webb has done us good service. He has visited India as a messenger of peace and of good will. He has been a sort of dove out of the ark, and those who have heard his words of wisdom and gentleness may add that he has brought an olive-branch in his mouth. (Hear and laughter.) I think he has shown that all classes in India, official and non-official, European and Indian, may work together harmoniously for the general welfare of India. Such being the case, I do trust that the Government will show a kindly feeling towards this movement which we know under the name of the Indian National Congress. (Hear, hear.) I can assure the Government that the object and feeling of that Congress is purely friendly to the British administration, that its fundamental doctrine is to preserve the overlordship of Great Britain in India. Indeed, in Indian opinion there is no alternative. The people of India do not want Russia in India. They do not want anarchy in India. But they do want the British Government. (Cheers.) What the Indian National Congress does is simply to point out to the British Government how it can remove practical grievances, how it can make its administration more popular, and how it can make firm the foundations of British rule in India. It affords also a genuine expression of Indian public opinion. Members of the Congress are elected in open public meeting in every one of the different provinces of the Indian Empire. (Hear, hear.) Every class and every caste is invited to join. Some of our opponents say that the Congress is not representative. Will they be good enough to tell us in what way we can make it more representative? (Hear, hear.) If they will, we will do our best to act upon their advice. (Hear, hear.) The Congress is a thoroughly practical body, giving really practical advice to the British Government. After all, it is the Indian people who best know where the shoe pinches. I always think that the relati nship between Parliament and Indian public opinion is something like the relationship between a doctor and his patient. The patient, however ignorant he may be, knows where his aches and pains lie. He tells the doctor what he feels and what are his symptoms, and it is the duty of the doctor to make a corr ct diagnosis and find out the remedy, so as to ensure a satisfactory cure. Even if the patient asks for the wrong remedy, it need not be given to him, but at least he must describe what he feels, and it is on that information that the doctor acts. It is in the same way highly advantageous that the British Government should have an opportunity of knowing through the Indian National Congress the real feelings of the people. (Hear, hear.) I would only say it will be with the deepest regret that I shall learn that Mr. Stansfeld has not, as his friends have asked him to do, reconsidered his determination to retire from Parliament. But, whether he remains in the House of Commons or whether he enjoys more leisure outside the House, I do trust that he will continue to give his kindly regard to Indian affairs, and to support us with his wise counsels and with the valuable personal influence he will always carry with him. (Cheers.)

The toast was heartily received.

Mr. STANSFELD: I will not detain you in endeavouring to express my thanks to Sir Wm. Wedderburn for the exceedingly kind way in which he has spoken of me, or for the kind way in which you have received his remarks. I accept all he said, and I accept the way in which you have received what he said, with the gratitude and appreciation which it deserves. I desire to say only one word more before we separate. I was struck during the speech of Sir William Hunter with the declaration that he abjured the phrase "subject races." It did not occur to me that I had inaccurately used that phrase, but still I was delighted to be reproved. Gentlemen, all higher minds in the service of this country in India are of the opinion of Sir Wm. Hunter. (Hear, hear.) But it is not in human nature that the whole mass of the rank and file, military and civil, representing a nation which practically governs a multitude of other nations under its sway—though you may not call them subject races—I say it is not in human nature that every one of them should be full of the sentiment which Sir Wm. Hunter expressed. (Hear, hear.) I admired and indeed expressed my admiration of Mr. Webb's distinct appreciation of the high value of our civil and military services, and especially of our civil service, in India, and of the potency and the character of the men engaged in that service. (Hear.) I think he was right. I think it was a fine thing for a man presiding over that native Congress to take the opportunity of expressing that opinion. (Hear, hear.) But what I would venture to say to those most powerful and resourceful and able men who govern India, on the whole with more conscience than any governing race has ever governed before, is this: that the power in their hands is a power which tends to demoralise those who exercise it if they are not on their guard. The power by virtue of which they exercise it is not their power but is our power, and if it is our power it is our responsibility. (Cheers.) Therefore I would ask them not to forget that, though it is only right and just that we should defer greatly to them on Indian questions because of their trained experience and superior practical knowledge, yet when it comes to questions of great policy and principle, or questions of right and wrong, it is ultimately the opinion of this country and not the opinion of the Services of this country in that great dependency of India, which must determine their action and ours. I am profoundly convinced of the truth of what I have said, and I am glad that Sir William Hunter gave me an opportunity of saying it by the noble sentiments he expressed. I have said it in no spirit of disrespect whatever to the services. I agree, as far as my knowledge goes, with what Mr. Webb has said: that it is, of

its kind, the finest service that the world has ever known. But, the power being ours and the responsibility being ours, it must be understood sooner or later that the principles and methods of governing that the Legislature in India must observe must be in accordance with the principles and convictions of the English Parliament and of the English people. Gentlemen, I thank you heartily and gratefully for the kind way in which you have listened to me. (Loud cheers.)

The company then separated.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Writing on February 19th, the *Daily News* said:—The banquet in honour of Mr. Alfred Webb at the National Liberal Club yesterday may hereafter rank as a political event of no slight importance. Mr. Webb has lately returned from his successful presidency of the Indian National Congress, and he was welcomed by a representative gathering, under the chairmanship of Mr. Stansfeld. He had a most difficult position to fill in India, and he performed its duties with rare judgment and tact, and with a thorough devotion to the liberalising principles of the time. His presidency of the Congress has given him a higher place than ever in public esteem. Before he went out, he was known as a capable and upright man. He has returned with the reputation of a statesman. Ardent Nationalist as he is, he might easily have been tempted to turn his speeches into manifestoes of his own political views. He did nothing of the sort, but made the full allowances for the difficulties of the conquering as well as of the conquered races in India, and justly claimed for the people of this country a conscientious sense of their responsibilities. His conclusions from what he saw and heard are therefore entitled to the fullest and the most respectful consideration. They are, in the main, that the happiness and contentment of India are only to be secured by the application of the same general principles of government as those which have been found so successful here. We must learn to rule our great dependency by, as well as for, the people, as we are learning to rule Ireland, and as we have long since learned to rule our Colonies. The whole future of our Empire depends upon our mastery of this great lesson of history and of the signs of the times.

The *Daily Chronicle* wrote:—The complimentary luncheon to Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., at the National Liberal Club yesturday afternoon, was a notable success. The honour was thoroughly well deserved, and it was bestowed with a generous appreciation of his services to the cause of India as President of the tenth annual meeting of the Indian National Congress at Madras in the end of December last. The meeting, over which Mr. Stansfeld, M.P., presided, was widely representative and influential. There was present a goodly number of Members of Parliament, leading members of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, Indian gentlemen representative of various sections of the Indian peoples, and other sympathisers with the popular movements of progress in the Dependency. It was a pity that the Secretary of State for India could not have been present, for the experience might well have shaken his distrust of the National Congress and its supporters in India and here. The recurrent notes of the successive speakers sounded loyalty to the British Raj, cordial co-operation with the Government, and moderation in all things. There is no question whatever on the point of loyalty, for the Government of India and the Home authorities have again and again acknowledged frankly that the heart of India beats soundly towards England. The Indian communities fervently agree in recognising that the continuance of English rule in India is essential to the development and welfare of the country, and they dread the advances of Russia only less than the prospect of being left by us to their own devices. The authorities, however, are far from disposed to welcome assistance in the form that the Congresss-wallahs genially designate co-operation. In this attitude there is an unfortunate misconception. The very position of our officials, and especially the circumstances under which they perform their work, render it impossible for them to know the thoughts and feelings and necessities that press upon the people whose affairs they administer. No one could express more fully and emphatically than Mr. Webb and Mr. Stansfeld the excellence of the qualities that in the main distinguish the civil servants of the Crown in India. But, under the existing conditions, it is beyond human capacity, however able and however well-intentioned, to know all that our civil servants in India ought to know, in order to perform their duties with efficiency. We have laboured to extend the blessings of education to India, and we have held up to the Indian peoples a great example of what education can do for them. They have profited enormously by our educational institutions, and by our practical example. It seems, therefore, to be absurdly impossible to restrain them from following out our teaching to its natural consequences. The successive concessions that have been made by the Government are so many acknowledgments of the force of this reasoning. The difficulty is that the Government delays and yields grudgingly what it ought to concede opportunely and gracefully. Sir William Wedderburn, in his finely toned speech yesterday, said most justly that the patient knows best where his aches and pains are, and that his doctor ought to listen attentively not only to his account of his aches and pains, but also to his mistaken fancies about them. Now there can be no question but the National Congress is able to furnish trustworthy information and useful suggestion, inaccessible to the regular officials, yet such as would enable the Government to minister far more efficiently to the political and social health of India than it can possibly do without such extraneous aid. The barrier really lies in the foolish *amour propre* of officialism—a barrier most difficult to overcome. Almost every speaker testified, as of course, to the marked moderation of the National Congress, and to its careful adherence to practical measures. Still, it is never out of place to remind the Congress-wallahs of the fundamental importance of making each step sure, and taking their public along with them. Sir William Wilson

Hunter, who met with a deservedly warm reception, found that he was pushing an open door when he tentatively recommended moderation. Sir William enforced the necessity of proceeding cautiously, in view of the susceptibilities of the people in this country. We have always urged the same considerations in view also of the ever present danger of outstripping the mental progress of the masses of the Indian populations. The impression left by this pleasant recognition of Mr. Webb's mission must tend to confirm confidence in the ability and discretion that guide the proceedings of the Indian National Congress both in India and at home.

The *Manchester Guardian* said:—One point which ought to be kept in sight was not, we think, touched by any of the friends of India who spoke at the dinner given last night in honour of Mr. Alfred Webb. It is a point on which Mr. Webb himself has wisely laid stress before now. We mean the extent to which Indian methods of government and the habits of mind derived from their practice colour the political views of Englishmen influential in politics at home. The best illustration of this tendency is seen in the writings of the late Sir Henry Maine. After seven years' work in the government of India Maine came back to England to write an impeachment of democracy which must have made and confirmed more Conservatives than almost any other book of its time. It was very brilliant, very subtle, and very perverse. It showed all the force and skill of Maine's muscular and hard-trained mind. The perversity of it lay in the writer's extraordinary estimate of the sense and morality of the average voter of the poorer sort in civilised countries. What we have all heard from the retired colonel about the character of the natives of India, Sir Henry Maine unquestionably assumed to be equally true of the people of England and Ireland. "Roughs and clowns," we think, are the words which he thought sufficiently descriptive of most of the voters in, say, Manchester or Oldham. There is no such school of contempt for popular feeling and opinion as the bureaucratic government of alien and backward races offers to its administrators. We do not on that account condemn that system of government. In its place and time it is necessary, though of course a necessary evil at the best. But we should be jealously on our guard against the demoralising influence which it incidentally exercises even on some of the best and strongest natures employed in its service. Our system of government in India is one of the tributaries which feed the stream of anti-democratic feeling among well-to-do English people of the "professional" class or thereabouts, and a dim sense of this fact has no doubt a good deal to do with the rising inclination of English Liberals to criticise Indian administration with some severity. The other grounds of that inclination were so admirably described last night by Mr. Webb and other speakers that we may be excused for dwelling now on what is no doubt only a small consideration among many others that are more important, but still a consideration that should not be forgotten.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. A. WEBB, M.P.

"We have scarcely ever had a President of Congress equal to Mr. Webb in his thorough-going desire to understand the situation in all its bearings. Throughout he has been moderate, studiously moderate, but I venture to say, no one, certainly no outsider, has been at such pains to master the questions at issue. Most people, after filling such a post as was his at Madras last December for four days, are glad enough to fling business aside when the programme is over. Not so Mr. Webb. He spent days interviewing men connected with the movement, mastering details, studying the relations of the Congress to men and things. One could not but admire his conscientiousness. Don't believe him if he tells you one can see but little of a strange land in a month. If you set about the matter as he did, you may see more in a month than some people see in a lifetime."

So spoke one who knows the Congress movement from its foundation. I was therefore well prepared for Mr. Webb's observation that a month in India resembles a page out of a book for purposes of criticism.

"How did India impress me? I have enjoyed a great experience, but feel some difficulty in assimilating and arranging all that I have heard and seen. I can only compare it to the rapidly changing pictures a kaleidoscope presents. Perhaps the deepest impression of all is the kindness and courtesy of the people. Although I was only there a month, and am far from desiring exile in a foreign land, yet I quitted India with regret, and only wish that I could return, in acts of sympathy on this side, some of the kindness and attention shown me in India."

"And you found the climate pleasant too?"

"Of course I did. India in December and January has a delightful climate. My friends took care to warn me that I should need to traverse the whole zodiac before generalising upon the climate, and above all to live through July and August in the plains. At any rate, my friends at home found me looking much better for the change."

"How did the Indian people strike you?"

"They are an able people. I was struck by their reasonable ideas, and by their recognition of the necessities and limitations of the political situation in India. A very large number of them have fine intelligent faces; one sees that they are sprung from a noble race. The pathos of the life of the common people impressed me. They are patient, gentle, enduring, hard-working. One hardly ever sees a fierce-looking individual. The Indian plan of life is different from ours. Indians dislike change. To break away from the constituted rules of society is sinful; they cling to the past with wonderful tenacity."

"I suppose you were impressed with India's poverty?"

"Yes, one quickly learns that the 'wealth of India' is mere poetic licence. India is a miserably poor land. The poor belongings of an Indian household—why they are an object lesson in poverty, they speak volumes. I had got the idea that the native savings were always invested in bangles and silver ornaments for the women. I was astonished to find that very often they are mere glass and tinsel, of

no value whatever. I expect my idea is true to some extent, but to a much smaller extent than I expected. They lay up in ornaments what the poorest of our people lay up in burial funds."

"Did you come across any examples of striking poverty?"

"At Delhi and other places I went about the poor quarters of the city quite alone, seeing as much as I could. You have only to watch the money transactions of the people to realise how poor they are. An anna is rather less than a penny; there are twelve pie in an anna. As if that were not small enough, each pie is again divided into 21 cowries. I saw the shells piled up in numbers of the poorer native shops. I found a printer's wages 10d. per week for thirty-six hours' work. I was a good deal interested in the tariff hung on the walls of a hotel in a northern city. (Charge of punkahwallah per day or night, 3 annas, keep of a Sahib's dog, 4 annas, horse, 6 annas.) In the face of great poverty, it is easy to understand how a failure in the crops or a slight increase in taxation may cause grave disarrangement of the social organism."

"How did the Anglo-Indian strike you?"

"I was favourably impressed so far as intentions are concerned. I may say that I left with a better impression both of the people and of the government than that which I landed with. And though my time was short, I moved a good deal about when Congress rose. I am persuaded there has never been a body of men equal in their way to Indian Civil Servants. They are strong, trained, able, resourceful. It occurred to me that entrance to the service by means of a competitive examination is not at all the bad system some would have us believe. But though a splendid instrument, they are not the people of India. They should live for India; India does not live for them. I do not feel sure that they sufficiently realise their position in the country. There is not enough consideration for Indian feeling. For hundreds of years England has known nothing of subjection to foreign rule, of its bitterness and humiliation even when the chains are gilded. However excellent are the intentions of rulers, nothing can atone for lack of courtesy, for insufficient consideration of the feelings of the people. It may be questioned whether a bad Government possessing these qualities might not be more secure than a Government almost a model in every other respect."

"Have you read Darmesteter's book in which he sums up our rule in India: '*L'Anglaise n'est point aimé?*'

"No, I have not read it. But, though quite willing to acknowledge that all Anglo-Indians are not the same in respect of discourtesy to the natives, it is certainly far too wide-spread to be lightly passed over. And it is strange to notice that the very people who are most open to blame on this account, are themselves extremely sensitive to criticism. Recollecting that they have the powder and shot, the cannon, and the magazine rifles, the big posts and high pay, it is not too much to expect them to grant the people full use of their tongues."

"Did you personally observe any instances of discourtesy?"

"Yes. On landing at Bombay, it was dark, and there was much confusion. Porters rushed to seize luggage, passengers were disembarking, passengers' friends advancing to meet them. I observed a sailor take a stick and beat back dark-skinned persons indiscriminately down the companion ladder. I have reason to believe that some of the friends who came to meet me were struck. This was the fault of the arrangements, but in England such a thing could hardly occur. Order would be preserved by preconcerted arrangements, not by blows. In a first-class railway carriage, there was empty sleeping accommodation for five persons besides myself in the compartment. The other compartment was for ladies. The only other first-class European passenger, wishing to be alone, settled himself in the ladies' compartment. At a side station some Parsi ladies evidently wished to enter it. To my surprise, the gentleman, looking out of the window, did not get out, and these ladies had to travel second-class. I also heard a young officer cursing and swearing at his servants for irregularities that here would scarcely attract a mild rebuke. However great the provocation, it is not wise. Upon the outward passage I heard language regarding my own people and India that made my cheeks tingle."

"I fancy most people who travel in India have seen as bad as that, and some have observed much worse. How did the Congress pass off, Mr. Webb?"

"Very well. Everything was excellently arranged, like clockwork, so that the President's task was comparatively easy. Those who managed it have certainly a considerable talent for organisation—not too common as we all know. There were said to be 1,200 delegates and 1,800 visitors. It is not an easy task to arrange for such an army. Another thing that impressed me was the admirable command of English that all but a small percentage of the speakers possess, upon the whole,—excellent classic English, different from our slipshod vulgarisms and sentences loosely tacked together. On this side, we hear a great deal about Babu English, and amusing samples are selected for us to read, so that perhaps I am not the only one who had a perverted idea of the real state of affairs. Anyhow, the speaking reached a high average."

"It is whispered that the Sahib himself rather 'hums and haws' when he comes to speak Urdu, or any Indian language, and that only politeness prevents natives displaying their enjoyment."

"Very probably. After the Congress was over a Social Conference met, in which, of course, natives alone could take part. We outsiders were, however, invited to seats on the platform. In many ways it was as interesting as the Congress itself. There was admirable speaking, and resolutions were passed regarding early marriages, nautch girls, the relaxation of caste rules as to foreign travel, the re-marriage of widows, against the use of intoxicants, the establishment of conciliation bodies to settle dissensions between Hindus and Muhammadans, private morals and so forth. Seeing that the resolutions passed at the Congress proper have appeared in the pages of INDIA, I need not specify them."

"I suppose that you will consider the Congress

movement a logical outcome of Lord Macaulay's policy as regards the education of the Indian people?"

"Certainly. Nothing else could have been expected. Macaulay foresaw all this, worked actively for it, and yet one would imagine it had come upon some people as a surprise. Danger is likely to result if the Government fail to recognise the expansion of mind which has resulted from Western culture. If the supremacy of the United Kingdom remains absolutely unquestioned, our laws and regulations may be pushed too far. It is for this reason I regard the Congress as valuable, in order to acquaint Government with the wishes of the people. Its true policy ought to be the encouragement of the movement. It affords what is required, a safety-valve. England is quick enough to perceive to what the lack of such an outlet for energy leads among foreign nations."

"Its opponents often say that Congress wants Home Rule for India. Some even explain this to mean every man having a vote and using it against England's supremacy."

"I was impressed by the moderation, the reasonableness of the Congress demands. So far as I could learn, no one even suggested Home Rule for India. I do not remember to have heard it named. And voting, as we understand it, is not on the cards. Indians have their own way of choosing their representatives, a method not unlike that in which the members of Parliament used to be chosen in the old County Courts. As practical men and women, we do not need to trouble about what lies in the remote future. The question for the present is our acceptance of such representation as we find to hand. The official denial of its reality received a severe blow last year when Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was accorded that wonderful ovation which marks an epoch in India's history. We may be pretty sure it carried its lesson and was well marked."

"I read that you drew some comparisons between India and Ireland, Mr. Webb."

"India is held by a light hand, not so Ireland. All the time I was in India, I do not remember to have seen three British soldiers together; with us, alas! it has been different. I have not forgotten the Mutiny, or the horrors then enacted on both sides. I gazed on the monuments erected to British heroes at Delhi and elsewhere with deep interest. But still, India has not the same bitter memories as Ireland. Government has not interfered with the lives, property, religious convictions, or education of the people, and, whatever difficulties may arise in the future, there must surely be an easier and speedier settlement than Ireland has known."

"Did you travel much in the country when the Congress was over?"

"Yes, considering the time at my disposal, I did a good deal, moving about alone. I saw the work of the Catholic missionaries in Bombay and Madras, and the Friends' missionaries in the Central Provinces. I went into the jungle among the Gonds, a poor, simple people, who dwelt in the land before the Aryan invasion. I deplore the introduction of drink among them; it can have but one end. The very night before our arrival a tiger had carried off an ox from one of the villages. All the time I was there we had fires burning nightly to scare off wild beasts. I found some admirable schools at work, especially under the Catholics in Bombay and Madras, the Friends in the Central Provinces, the Church College at Agra, and technical schools in Baroda. In the latter there is excellent instruction in drawing, modelling, ironwork, carpentry, weaving, dyeing, all practical. Education is one of India's great needs; especially is it necessary to spread the idea that manual labour is honourable, that headwork ought not to be the sole aim of an educated individual. At Alibagh, a few miles out of Bombay, I saw more of the life of the people than elsewhere. One thing there struck me as it has struck me at home: the ancient rights of the people to common lands have been unduly and unwisely interfered with. One practice on the part of the Government seemed to me peculiarly unjust. The land is not always valued on its present condition, but on the condition to which the Government valuers believe it might be brought. There is little doubt that the people are pressed to the furthest verge of subsistence. Regarding the country itself, the people, and the Government, Tennyson's lines return constantly to the mind—

'Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell.'"

C. S. B.

MR. A. WEBB, M.P., AT BOMBAY.

FAREWELL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS.

Before returning from India to London, Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Tenth Congress, delivered a farewell address at the Gaiety Theatre, Bombay, on January 17th. He was received by the audience with loud and prolonged cheers, flowers being showered upon him when he took his seat on the stage. We take the following passages from Mr. Webb's address:—

"WE MUST MAKE UP OUR MINDS."

I cannot adopt the cant that the more one knows about India, the less one knows, or—as it was put by a fellow-passenger the other day—"after thirty years in India you find you know nothing whatever about it." It would be better if such gentlemen said at at once what they mean, that no one but a paid official of the Government has ever any right to aim at knowing anything about India. Such doctrines may suit the "man on the fence," but they would not suit us politicians. We cannot pass our days in philosophic doubt. We must make up our minds upon the questions that come before us. We must act. When Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir William Wedderburn say one thing, and Sir Richard Temple and Sir George Chesney another, we are bound to choose between them. After spending a few weeks in India I must be better able to form correct views regarding the country.

THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.—"HERE TO DO OUR BIDDING."

I adhere to all I said regarding the general character of the Indian Civil Service. Further observations rather tend to strengthen that opinion. There has never been any other service to equal it. Never, until upon the passage out, did I find myself amongst such a number of strong, trained, able, resourceful men. In the House of Commons we are not necessarily chosen on account of our ability to pass certain mental tests. This admission is, however, no warrant for the conclusion that to such men alone should be left the Government of India. A bureaucracy may be a splendid force in its way. Seldom were more bravery and devotion, more spirit and self-abnegation shown than in the South by the planters in the American Civil War. Here a corresponding class should remember that whilst they are a splendid instrument, whilst they can be depended upon to labour for the empire with unceasing devotion, they are not the people of India. They live for India: India does not live for them. In the face of all they may asseverate to the contrary, the electorate of the United Kingdom and the House of Commons are their masters. They are here to do our bidding, and neither appeal nor bluster will in the long run permanently compel us to do theirs.

THE FEELINGS OF THE MASSES.

And in this regard, judging by the language and attitude of Anglo-Indians I have met on shipboard and in India—my ears often tingled—judging by some of my own personal experiences, quite apart from anything I may have heard, there is not, on the part of many of them, enough realisation of their position in this country, enough consideration for the feelings of the masses of those with whom they are brought in contact. Realising the disastrous results of such conduct on the part of a similar class in Ireland, I cannot but presage evil here. "The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small." Such bearing, such conduct in Ireland, has had to the uttermost, in one form or another, to be expiated.

THE MODERATION OF THE CONGRESS.

What especially struck me regarding the speeches at the Congress was their moderation. Yet an official with whom I talked judged many of them as being the contrary. The official class, from which are drawn so many careless of the feelings of others, is the very class most sensitive regarding its own.

I am said to have acted the part of Balaam—to have blessed where you desired I should curse. If so, you yourselves showed singularly little appreciation of the fact. You never said to me "Therefore, now flee thou to thy place." My most moderate utterances were those best received by you both publicly and privately. And any kindness meted out to me before the delivery of the address in which I was said to act the part of Balaam, was as nothing to that which I received afterwards. In my country there is an old song with the refrain "Perhaps it was right to dissemble your love, but why did you kick me downstairs?" I might vary it and ask: "Perhaps it was wise to dissemble your hate, but why did you kill me with kindness?" If the address was moderate in tone, and yet favourably received by you, is this not proof that you yourselves are moderate in your aspirations? Much stronger language would be allowable on your part than on mine. Sympathise as I may, the iron of British Indian rule has not entered my soul as doubtless it often enters yours, any more than has the iron of British Irish rule entered yours. It is easy for an outsider to be moderate.

The proceedings of the Congress were in truth from first to last characterised by the greatest moderation—by greater moderation than they would have been if conducted by Englishmen in their cooler clime treating of subjects of similar moment.

THE CONGRESS "ADMIRABLY ARRANGED."

I have seen many great gatherings, but no other in which the arrangements were so complete, and in which everything passed off so like clock-work. This was, of course, due to the untiring exertions of the Reception Committee, to the officials, and, in no small measure to the volunteers. The presidency of a Congress so admirably arranged and worked proved a comparatively easy task. I can never allow that your people are not in a large measure endowed with the power of organisation.

The first resolution naturally referred to the excise regulations regarding manufactured cotton, which at present occupy so much of the attention of your manufacturers, and concerning which the public opinion of India is almost at one. It is too complicated a question for me to descant upon. I was brought up in a Free-Trade school. But you, I consider, have to the full the same right to try economic experiments as have the Colonies, and your desires should not be sacrificed to the exigencies of party politics at home. But there is little doubt they will continue to be so sacrificed, and that confusion at home is certain to ensue, until in some way India is placed more upon its own feet than at present. Cannot the officials and manufacturing and trading classes who here side with you upon this question, perceive that under the present arrangements you will continue to be played off one against the other,—that when it suits the Home Government, now one, now the other, class will be sacrificed? The arguments so consistently put forward upon most occasions by one party, that Indian public opinion is incompetent to judge wisely, will, by the Home Government, naturally be availed of as an excuse for setting at defiance the united general public opinion of this country.

THE POVERTY OF INDIA.

Personally, I have no means of judging as to the proportion of your population, stated in the third resolution, to be on the verge of starvation, or as to the number of those who every decade perish from starvation. But if from India I carry away any one impression more definite than another, it is concerning the miserable state in which most of your population appear to be immersed. The evidence of my senses ill accorded with the roseate pictures drawn by the ex-officials in the House of Commons. If the condition of the people in and about Bombay, Madras, Itarsi, Agra, Delhi, Baroda, and

along the railway lines connecting those centres, is any criterion, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's estimate of Rs. 20 per head as the average annual income of the population of India is not unduly low. I can speak of only what I myself have seen upon the roads, at well sides, in the country bazaars. The gold and silver bangles and ornaments I heard so much about were, for the most part, represented by iron, glass, or tinsel. Compositors' wages in Madras are Rs 3 to Rs 4 per month, for 36 hours per week. Labourers upon the roads in the Central Provinces are paid Rs 4 to Rs 6. In the hotel I stayed at in a northern city, the charge for a punkahwallah per day or night was at 3 annas, while the keep of a horse was put down at 6, and that of a dog at 4 annas. The general use of cowries both in the Central Provinces and in Agra and Delhi is significant proof of the smallness of the transactions and the poverty of the people. A pie, (the fifteenth part of a penny), is divided again into the twelfth part of an anna, 21 cowries. Collections of these shells ready to give in change are piled up upon the boards of most of the poorer shops in Delhi. I was struck with the admirable light-heartedness and good humour of the people under such conditions. The least disarrangement of the social organism, either by failure of crops or otherwise, would certainly plunge them into a condition of hopeless famine. This state of things calls for economy and circumspection on the part of the Government.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

The sixth resolution dealt with the much debated question of Simultaneous Examinations. At one time we thought that question was settled by the division on Mr. Paul's resolution; but the representations of the permanent officials have thrown it back into the melting pot with little prospect of its proximate remoulding in a form satisfactory to us. Open competitive examinations may not be a perfect means of ascertaining a man's capacity to serve the Government and the public. But it is surely more likely to be a sufficient test than selection which too often implies subserviency and the exercise of backstairs influence. Strong independent minds, those which it is most desirable to attract, are not always those most likely to commend themselves by the arts which, as we must all feel, are likely to influence in promotion by selection. If the present method of examination is not supposed to be an effective test, would it not be possible to evolve one that would—one in which the memory might have less, and the innate qualities, the judgment of the man, more play? There is no question upon which the Civil Service here appears more united than in its opposition to the simultaneous proposal. It most closely affects their personal interests, and where personal interests are involved no man can be considered an unbiassed judge. There never appeared to ordinary outside mortals a clearer question of right or wrong than that of the disestablishment of the Irish Church. India's Civil Servants can scarcely claim to be better or more unbiassed men than were the clergymen of the Church in Ireland. Yet although the interests of present incumbents were fully guarded, they were, so far as I can recollect, all except a single man opposed to the change. What would have been thought if such a question as tha of the Irish Church were to have been decided upon their report alone rather than upon broad common-sense grounds, such as also originally moved the House of Commons regarding Simultaneous Examinations? The resolution in the matter of these examinations rightly declares that in opposition to them a new principle is being introduced inconsistent with the Charter Act of 1833 and the Proclamation of the Queen of 1858—creating a disability founded upon race. No attempt has been made to make out a case against the holding of Simultaneous Examinations for recruitment of the Engineering, Forest, Telegraph and higher Police services.

SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

The twelfth resolution voiced the feelings of the country regarding the necessity for greater separation of the judicial and executive functions. In my conversations with friends in the different parts of India I found no question claimed more attention or was considered to go down deeper to the roots of the social fabric. One gentleman, eminent alike for his talents and his position, went so far as to suggest that a whole Congress should be devoted to its elucidation.

EDUCATION.

Nothing could be more unfortunate than that the Government grants for education should be in any degree curtailed. Education is what India requires before everything. I am glad they have increased from Rx.2,171,000 in 1883-4 to Rx.3,185,000 in 1892-3. But what proportions do these augmentations bear to the military expenditure within the same period—from Rx.17,155,000 to Rx.23,012,000? An opposite process is going on at home, where State assistance for education is less necessary than here. Within the United Kingdom £9,172,000 was in 1893-94 spent in education, whilst £32,000,000 went to the army. In your case education constitutes thirteen per cent., in ours twenty-eight per cent. of the relative military expenditure. It appears to me that technical education is the education here most required. Day by day engineering and mechanical pursuits are affording wider fields for the employment of your young men. It is important that they should be attracted into them, that they should learn that they are as honourable a means of living as, and often more independent than, others generally considered more gentlemanly. An English locomotive superintendent on one of your principal lines lamented to me the difficulty of procuring native employés in what is a comparatively well-paid calling. An English head gardener spoke similarly with regard to his business. Some of the Native States are setting an example. Scarcely anything gave me greater pleasure in India than a visit I paid a few days ago to the admirable technical schools at Baroda. We have nothing at all to equal them in Ireland. They are thoroughly practical in their conception and scope. Above 400 youths are there receiving instruction in all the branches of technical work, from freehand drawing and chemistry, through modelling and ivory carving, to carpentry, iron work, dyeing, and calico printing. The Society of Friends are doing something in the same way regarding iron-

work and carpentry at Itarsi. Surely what is possible in a Native State and to a small religious society should be possible to the great Imperial Government? Regarding technical education and some other questions, you have here a freer hand than we at home. Progress upon the best lines is not here fettered by the economic considerations and jealousies (mistaken, as I consider) of the labouring classes.

THE ARMS ACT.

The modification of the rules under the Arms Act sought in your omnibus resolution in no degree clashes with my suggestion that "all questions relating to arms and armed forces of the Crown must be treated with circumspection, that we must weigh well our words and the difficulties of the situation." There can be little doubt that in certain districts liberal concessions of licenses are necessary for the preservation of human life, cattle, and crops. The general policy of the Government regarding arms would be more likely to receive the contentment and loyal support of the people if it proceeded upon uniform, fair, and definite lines. How comes it that rights considered safe in a Native State are not deemed so in British territory? I can scarcely imagine anything more galling, anything more likely to engender bitter feelings than that Europeans *as such* should be allowed to carry arms—that aliens are permitted to enter volunteer corps, from which you are excluded. In so far as licenses are necessary, let them be granted all round. This would hurt no one. If Natives are not permitted to enter volunteer corps, what strength derivable from the maintenance of small bodies of European volunteers is likely to counterbalance the irritation that the exclusion must cause? With us in Ireland the wealthiest Englishman as the humblest peasant has to apply for his license. The formation of volunteer corps is forbidden to all.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

I was permitted to move from the chair a resolution which declared: "that this Congress earnestly entreats her Majesty's Government to grant the prayer of her Majesty's Indian subjects, resident in the South African Colonies, by vetoing the Bill of the Colonial Government disfrachising them." Surely this appeal will not be in vain. Surely the great Indian people, proud in their traditions, proud in their anticipations, are not in another portion of the Empire to be classed below what may be the offspring of European civilisation. If the Empire cannot for you enforce parity of treatment in any one of its Colonies, the sooner the better it turns that Colony off on its own account. The very conception of united Empire is shattered by such proposals as those made in South Africa.

THE CONGRESS "YOUR SHEET ANCHOR."

You must hold to this Congress movement as your sheet anchor and sure shield of defence; nothing can imperil or destroy its existence but the abandonment of the safe lines upon which you have hitherto proceeded. Build up the fabric of your liberties upon sober sense, upon ascertained and well digested facts, well put forward, upon adherence to the law, upon a charitable construction of the motives of your opponents. Every effort has been made and will be made to break you up—to cause discord amongst yourselves—to set class against class in this country. None can be truly safe but in the common weal. Cultivate a wide and all-embracing spirit. If you feel intolerable the assumptions of any class here which seeks to dominate you, think how those must feel who in your midst are still marked off from general sympathy. For none have I felt more compassion than for the very poorest, the most despised classes of your people. Surely the brotherhood of man, that great principle upon which the Congress is mainly founded, is a noble idea worthy of all acceptance. To that idea Christianity in all its better and higher manifestations owes its vital force. There is a joy in the principle of human equality that once experienced can never be bartered away. Inequalities there will always remain through natural endowments, through education and opportunities. At least let us make these inequalities as light as possible. It is a joy at home to realise that the man and the woman, the master and the servant, he that blacks our boots or clears out our dustbin, are divided by no artificial lines. It is happier for employer and employed alike that under the Factory Acts the one is compelled to consider the other more than previously. The House of Commons has gained in dignity and usefulness by the presence as members of the sailor, the fireman, the tailor, the shoemaker, and the compositor. . . .

Cultivate a lofty and self-respecting manly spirit, do not imitate those who seek to raise themselves and ingratiate themselves with your rulers by decrying their own abilities and those of their fellow-countrymen. Certain resolutions and declarations of opinion that have caught my eyes in the columns of your newspapers remind me of nothing more than the cringing of slaves who declare that they had rather not be freeman.

How can the Anglo-Indian Government in its heart of hearts continue to regard your movement with aught but approval? It is in truth "the richest fruit of that noble mission of which we, the citizens of the United Kingdom, should be proud, the greatest combined peaceful effort for the good of the largest number of the human race that history has recorded." Wherever I went, in schools and colleges I found your young men studying English history—and what other lesson is to be learned from that history but the desirability for men and nations alike of the steady progress of constitutional liberty? If the Congress is to be regarded with jealousy—discredited, despised, by the official classes—they should at least have been mindful in time, and like the Southern slave-holders made it penal to teach you to read. There was no halting between the two paths. They deliberately chose the better, that which has led to the Congress. This path cannot be retraced. But now another serious bifurcation is before them. Are they prepared by opposition to thwart and embarrass, or by sympathy and advice to help to guide into a secure haven and still waters? Whatever may be the temporary aberrations of baffled ascendancy, I have little doubt as to the decision of that sound sense which in the long run has hitherto characterised the people of the United Kingdom.

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 1. MARCH, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from February 7th to February 21st.

Imperial Parliament.

February 7th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Viscount CROSS gave notice that at an early day he would call attention to the delay which had taken place in the presentation of the report of the Opium Commission. The noble Viscount said the sittings of the Commission were concluded before the prorogation of the last Session; and the House was promised that it should receive the report during the autumn. The report had not, it was quite unnecessary to say, been yet presented to Parliament. It was, in his opinion, very unfair to the Indian Government to be kept so long in ignorance of what the recommendations of the report were. The noble Viscount gave notice that at the same time he would call attention to the apportionment of the cost of the Commission. If India was made to bear one-half of the cost, the burden would ba both hard and unfair.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Captain SINCLAIR asked the Secretary of State for India whether the papers in regard to the Indian cotton import duties were ready, and whether they would be laid before the House and circulated to members before the conclusion of the discussion on the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The papers were laid on the Table of the House on Tuesday, and they will be delivered to hon. members to-day.

GRIEVANCES OF THE STAFF CORPS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had yet received an answer from the Government of India to his despatch sent from the India Office at the end of May last year on the subject of the grievances of officers in the Staff Corps:

Whether he was now in a position to lay upon the Table the papers relating to these grievances, including the memorandum submitted to the late Commander-in-Chief and his suggestions thereon:

And whether any decision, and, if so, what, had been arrived at on the subject.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: A reply has been received from the Government of India, and the subject is now under my consideration in communication with the War Office.

THE HEMP DRUGS COMMISSION.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India when the report of the Hemp Drugs Commission would be ready.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The Government of India are considering the report of the Hemp Drugs Commission.

When the report comes home with their observations I will inform my hon. friend.

February 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE ABOR TRIBES IN ASSAM.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had obtained the information asked for by the hon. member for the Holmfirth Division on the 12th June last, namely, whether the treaties concluded with the Abor tribes in Assam in 1862, 1863, and 1866 were still operative:

Whether the British Government was still under obligation to pay yearly to the Meyong Abors eighty bottles of rum and two seers of opium; to the Kebang Abors forty bottles of rum and two seers of opium; to the Abors of Dehang Debang Doars 100 bottles of rum; to the Bor Abors 100 bottles of rum and two seers of opium:

And whether those payments were still made; and, if not, when they ceased to be paid, and what had been substituted.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have made the enquiry asked for by the hon. member, and learn that the payment of rum and opium, as well as of other dues in kind stipulated for in the treaties, was commuted in 1877 to money payments, aggregating Rs. 3,312 annually.

INDIA OFFICE CONTRACTS.

Mr. LOGAN asked the Secretary of State for India if a large order for cardigan jackets, to be supplied to the army in India, had been given to a Leipsic firm; and, if so, what was the reason for sending such an order out of this country at a time of severe depression in home industries.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: No stores for the Government of India can be ordered in Europe except through the India Office; and no order for cardigan jackets has been issued from the India Office since May, 1892, when a contract for the supply of such jackets was entered into with a Leicester firm.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. RENSHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether the countervailing excise duty on Indian-made cottons was to be charged only on counts above 21s.; and, if so, whether he could state what proportion the cotton yarn spun in India above 21s. bears to the total annual production of the Indian mills:

Whether it was the case that cotton yarns 21s., or under, spun in India at Bombay, and shipped to the port of Rangoon, would be admitted free of all duty, whilst similar yarn spun in this country would be subject to the duty of five per cent.:

And whether Indian yarn above 21s. would be taxed on its grey value only, whilst dyed yarns exported from this country, as was the case with Turkey red yarns produced in the Vale of

Leven in Dumbartonshire, would have to pay duty on the value of the dyed yarn, and that this would practically make the duty on the Scotch yarn twice as much as the duty on the Indian yarn, and would seriously prejudice the position of the Scotch manufacturers.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: (1) The Cotton Duties Act, 1894, imposes excise duty on yarns made in Indian mills of any count above 20s. I cannot give statistics of India-made yarns above 21s., but the papers distributed yesterday show that not more than six per cent. of the yarns made at Indian mills are of counts over 24.

(2) It is the case that no customs duty is payable upon Indian yarns conveyed by sea or otherwise from one part of India to another.

(3) The excise duty is levied on Indian yarns as grey yarns, and customs duty, *ad valorem*, on imported dyed yarns; but I am not prepared to admit the inferences indicated in the hon. member's question. I have forwarded the statement of the Scotch manufacturers on this subject to the Indian Government, and am waiting for their observations thereon.

February 11th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE CANTONMENTS BILL.

Mr. Walter M'Laren asked the Secretary of State for India what steps the Indian Government was taking consequent upon the Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the rules, regulations, and practice in the Indian cantonments with regard to the treatment of venereal disease:

Whether legislation was proposed, in conformity with the report of the Committee, in reference to the system of periodical examination of prostitutes, that the only effective method of preventing those systematic practices which have been maintained was by means of express legislation; and, if so, what are the terms of the Bill:

And, how soon was it expected that the Bill would become law.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: A Bill dealing with the subjects of my hon. friend's question was introduced into the Legislative Council by the Indian Government last July; the text of the Bill was published in the *Gazette;* and the opinions of the local Governments were, according to the regular practice, obtained. The consideration of the Bill was proceeded with when the Council reassembled in Calcutta, and it was referred to a Select Committee.

I am informed by telegraph that the Bill has now passed with some amendments. I expect to receive copies of the Act by the mail which leaves India this week.

ANGLO-INDIANS AND THE C.D. ACTS.

Mr. Hanbury: With reference to the foregoing question, will the right hon. gentleman state whether the Government have received certain representations from t e Commander-in-Chief in India with respect to the ravages that have been committed by this class of disease in India, and, if so, whether he will lay those representations on the Table. I would also ask whether it is a fact that the Commander-in-Chief in India, speaking upon the Cantonments Bill two or three days ago, said the admissions into hospitals of cases of such disease in 1893 amounted to nearly 50 per cent. of the entire European force, but that it was impossible to estimate in figures the resulting loss of efficiency, and that it would certainly prove lamentable if an army were tried by long marching or by a severe campaign.

Mr. Fowler: I cannot give any answer as to the accuracy of telegraphic reports of what transpires in Calcutta. I have already had an experience of inaccuracy with regard to a telegraphed summary of a speech by the Viceroy. If the newspapers who gave that summary had, in justice to the Viceroy, given the full speech when it came over by mail, it would have been seen that what was really said was precisely the contrary of the meaning conveyed by the telegram.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA.

On the motion of Mr. Caine, there was granted an Address for "Return of the number of persons (1) brought to trial in each province of British India in each year from 1883 to 1892, inclusive, for offences for which capital sentences might be inflicted, specifying those originally tried by the High Court in each presidency town, and those originally tried by the Mofussil Sessions Courts; (2) the number of persons sentenced to death for each offence by the High Courts originally and by the Sessions Courts, also the number of instances in which the capital sentences of the Sessions Judges were upheld, reversed, or commuted by the High Courts as Appellate or Confirming Courts; (3) the number of persons who received other sentences than death or were acquitted; and (4) the number of persons reprieved."

REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. John Ellis asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could now inform the House when it was likely to be in possession of any Report from the Royal Commission respecting the Indian Opium Traffic appointed in consequence of the Resolution of the House of June, 1893.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The Commission have for some weeks been working unremittingly at the preparation of their Report. Some delay is inevitable owing to the residence in India of two of the members; but I have every reason to believe that the House will be in possession of the Report before Easter.

February 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EAST INDIA RAILWAY BILL.

In the House of Commons to-night the East India Railway Bill was brought up by Sir James Kitson and Sir George Chesney, and was read a first time.

AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS.
INDIAN EXPENDITURE.
MR. NAOROJI AND MR. FOWLER.

Mr. Naoroji, resuming the debate on the Address said: I beg to move as an amendment to add the following words, "And we humbly pray that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct your Majesty's Ministers to so adjust the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India, with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British-Indian services, civil and military, in this country and in India, that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer in proportion to the pecuniary and political benefits accruing to the United Kingdom from your gracious sway over India; and that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned." Before I proceed with that I beg to express my regret that in Her Majesty's gracious speeches generally there are no indications of concern or interest in this large empire of India, I do not wish to say anything as to the Government of India except to acknowledge with the deepest gratitude all the good that the British connection with India has done, and if I speak of the officials in India I mean no reflection on them. They are the creatures of circumstances and of a system, and whatever my complaints may be, they will always refer to the system and not to the officials. In moving the amendment, I do not for one moment purpose to ask for any charity, even though we are so poor. All I ask for is that in the name of justice India should be justly treated, should be fairly treated by Britain, and that the latter should pay a fair proportion of the expenditure to which I refer in my amendment. (Cheers.) It is sometimes said that I am an agitator, and that agitation in connection with India is a most undesirable thing. But we have it on the authority of Lord Macaulay that in England you have got a long series of magnificent reforms which we would have got in no other way. Agitation is inseparable from popular Government, and I ask you if the slave trade would ever have been abolished without agitation. Is it not far better that a reform which it is desired should be made should be discussed by peaceful agitation rather than by other and perhaps unfortunate means? In moving this amendment

I appeal to all parties in this honourable House, as there is no party spirit or person in connection with the matter. I appeal to the whole House as Englishmen and as representatives of the British public. There is an expenditure of 700 millions of rupees annually from the revenues of India, and its most important feature is that a portion of it is a drain on the country. We Indians admit the great benefit that Europeans have been to our country, and we do not seek to diminish or minimise that benefit in the slightest degree. The result of this cost is law and order, and India fully appreciates this blessing. But some law and order are absolutely essential to the existence of Europeans in that country as well as to the maintenance of British Rule, and those Europeans derive benefit from both sides. As to this law and order there is one important element in British India and that is that the Hindus, and those who are Muhammadans descended from the Indian race, have in their very nature, in their blood, and in their religious institutions, a love of law and order as an inheritance of some thousands of years. It is necessary that there should be peace and law and order, in order that teaching and learning should continue in the schools of one section of the race, and it is also necessary to the other professional and industrial classes, and to the traders and agricultural classes. All this benefit and interest depends upon law and order being maintained, and it is not their business or to their benefit that they should fight against law or order. To a particular section was left the fighting and protesting business. Consequently you have in India a most important guarantee in the very nature of the people that law and order will be maintained. I wish to propose one test which I will ask you to apply to England in order to realise what I mean. Supposing that England was occupied by a number of foreigners, that the House was occupied by them, and that all the public offices and all important posts and positions were held by them. I am not making a very extraordinary supposition, but I merely do it for a test. You well know that when Julius Cæsar invaded this country, no human being ever dreamt that the savages clothed in paint would become, two thousand years afterwards, the owners of a mighty Empire. Nor would anybody have said that Rome and Italy, which were the masters of the world, would after some few hundreds of years become only geographical names. However, empires have come and gone, so that the supposition I am making is not absolutely impossible. I do not wish it to happen to Britain from the bottom of my heart; I desire that the British people should remain the same as they are, the same lovers of liberty, and the same liberty-giving people;—(hear, hear)—but supposing that by some of the vicissitudes of fortune such a thing occurred, and the British people were subjected to the same domination to which we are subjected. I do not hesitate to say that they would not submit to the evils of such a domination for a single moment or day. We know what they did in the time of the Normans, and I say that you have every reason, and I hope you will always be able, to sing that "Britons never will be slaves." (Cheers.) I ask whether it is the mission of Britons to make others slaves; I hope they will never say that that is their mission. (Hear, hear.) Taking that test, therefore, I appeal to the British people to consider this question very carefully. Sometimes we are told that Britain has secured India by the sword and that she will hold it by the sword. I will not say anything more on that head, but will just observe that the greatest present Indian general has spoken more wisely than many silly persons who have uttered ideas of that kind. Lord Roberts has said that however efficient and great the army may be, were it absolutely perfection and its numbers considerably greater than they are at present, our greatest security must rest on an united and contented India. (Hear, hear.) I hope that that will always be borne in mind. With regard to this law and order, it is absolutely necessary, you must bear in mind, that they should be preserved in the interests both of Indians and of the British people living there; therefore, whatever may be the cost of that law and order, it should not be placed entirely on the heads of the Indians unless they are to be treated as conquered slaves, and the British are to hold them as conquerors and oppressors. If it is not so, then in fair justice I think I may fairly demand that this cost of administration, the result of which is necessary to both, should be fairly divided between the two. (Hear, hear.) What is the Indian's benefit and what is the Briton's benefit. India has to pay to European services in both countries 200 millions of rupees annually. The result of that is that, that money being abstracted from the country and not returned to those who have produced it, the capacity of production goes on diminishing. We have under these circumstances no means of accumulating capital and improving our condition. Hundreds and thousands of millions of money are consumed and carried away in that way, and it places a monopoly of everything in British capital. We cannot compete with it, and the result is that you have not only the benefit of the officials receiving that money, but, under their patronage, of providing British traders, merchants, farmers, shipowners, planters, capitalists, and others. You have naturally a monopoly of all that has to be done, and the profits are all the profits of the British; we work for the British and for British profits, and the Indians are in a way worse off than the Southern slaves, for the reason that those slaves were taken care of and housed and fed by their masters. Further, they did not work on their own property, but the Indians do work on their own property, and give the profits of their work to the capitalists of European countries. The benefits received by the Indian are insignificant when compared with Britain's benefit. I will only say, without labouring the point, that I would assume that the material benefit is equal to the Indian and the British, and that the English people should share equally in the cost. Lord Salisbury accurately described the present position when he said that "India must be bled." There was never a more accurate definition, and the result is that our finance ministers are obliged to complain year after year that the extreme poverty of India has not enabled them to bring the finances of India into a satisfactory condition. On the other hand, let us take a small Native State in which, from certain circumstances, a regency exists. The Minister is then always enabled to speak of the financial condition of that State in the warmest terms. The contrast between the British Indian system and the other was so remarkable that the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State had to some extent referred to it. But at present, in order to give you an idea of the financial position of India as compared with England, I will speak of only one subject. The right hon. gentleman the Secretary has stated that whereas the taxation of England is £2 11s. 8d. per head, of Scotland £2 8s. 1d., and of Ireland £1 12s. 5d., that of India is only something like 2s. 6d. per head, or one-twentieth that of the United Kingdom. That would mean that the incidence of taxation is extremely light in India. But let us take an illustration. Suppose England was producing £100, and that out of that it gives the Chancellor of the Exchequer £6, or 6 per cent., the incidence in India would then be only one-twentieth, or 3 per cent., very light and small as compared with England or Scotland or Ireland. This is the Anglo-Indian fiction. The fact is that when we consider the incidence of taxation we must consider not only what is the amount paid but what it is compared with the capacity of the people who pay it. An elephant can carry a ton or two, but an ant may be seriously exercised by a grain of wheat. To compare it properly we must see what percentage is taken out of the actual production. The annual production or income in this country per individual is admitted to be something like £35, and the taxation is six or seven per cent. In India the annual production or income is about 20 rupees per annum, per head, and when you consider that you will find that the incidence of taxation is about double—some 14 or 15 per cent. To say, therefore, that India is more lightly taxed is altogether a fiction. (Hear, hear.) The fact is that the pressure of taxation, according to its means of paying, is nearly double that of England. England can afford to pay whilst India is bleeding. This I hope will be clear to the minds of hon. members here; that India derives little benefit from the present system of British administration, and I say that if a system of righteousness were introduced instead of the present system—an inheritance of the last century—England in India would be blessed. The profit of England would be ten times greater, and we, instead of being crushed by that British Indian system would be blessed, and both would benefit. I appeal, therefore, to all hon. members to consider this question carefully and to realise that if the British Empire is to exist for the benefit of both they must let the principles of right and justice govern it. (Cheers.) I am willing, however, for the sake of argument, to accept the statement that our benefit is equal to the British benefit, but, even granting that, I may fairly ask that Britain may fairly share half the bill, and of the cost of producing the result from which both profit equally. But my amendment does not go so far as that. I do

not ask for even half of the whole amount. I only ask for a portion of that part of the expenditure which is really incurred on Europeans and that entirely for British rule. If it were not for British rule and for the necessity of maintaining it, there would be no necessity for Europeans, and we should not be drained in the manner we are. It has been declared by Lord Roberts that "the prosperity of the United Kingdom is bound up with the retention of that great Empire." Lord Kimberly has said, "We are resolutely determined to maintain our supremacy over our Indian Empire, and he added that that among other things rested upon the maintenance of our European Civil Service, and also upon the magnificent European forces which we maintained in that country." I am rather surprised that the lesson has been so soon forgotten. The European Civil Service is the weakest part in your maintenance of your rule there, for when the unfortunate troubles arose in 1857 the European civil servants and all the civil Europeans were the greatest difficulty. They must be saved; they were in the greatest danger in the midst of thousands and thousands of hostile people; and to suppose that the civil Europeans in such times could be a strength is contrary to common sense. Your security depends upon giving satisfaction to the people of India on this matter. You may create an empire by brute force, but you will never maintain it except by moral force founded on justice and righteousness. (Hear, hear.) I say, therefore, that if I asked that even the whole expenditure in regard of Europeans should be defrayed by the British Exchequer I would not be far wrong. I would be amply justified. It is for your benefit especially that you want this European element in the country. But for the sake of argument, I will accept that the benefit of the employment of Europeans, whether in the Military or Civil Service is equally enjoyed by the natives of India, and then I say that half of this expenditure at least should be paid from the British Exchequer. We are sometimes threatened that if we raise the question of the financial relations of India and Great Britain something will have to be said about the navy. But apart from paying a fair share for the vessels stationed in India on this point I need not quote a single opinion. Every speech made from this side or that side has acknowledged that for the protection of this United Kingdom alone you require a navy equal to the navies of any two of the European countries. You require every inch, every ounce of your navy for yourselves, and that you should ask for any payment on this account from us would be something very strange. (Hear, hear.) The sense of justice has prohibited, has prevented any such demand being so far made. But I may remind you that as to this navy the glory and gain is all your own. There is not a single Indian employé in it, and would it be just and fair to ask us to pay any portion of the cost under those circumstances? Lastly, we are told that this navy is necessary to protect British-Indian commerce as well as other commerce. There is not a single ship belonging to Indians going from India to other parts, or bringing cargo to India which is really an Indian ship. The whole shipping is British shipping. Not only that, but the whole cargo while afloat is at the risk of British money. There is nothing exported from India upon which British money does not rest through the East India banks. If I export 100 bales of cotton from India, I go to an East India bank and give the bill of lading to the bank and the bank gives me a price, within say 5 per cent. as a margin, and the risk, while the cargo is afloat is entirely on the money of the bank, which is British money. And in the same way when goods are exported from here, a similar process is gone through with a British bank, and it is British money which is risked on the transaction. I put it whether under the circumstances which I have detailed as briefly and quickly as possible, it is not a fact that if some of the benefits of British rule are allowed to be Indian benefits, some are purely European benefits, and therefore I say that a portion of the expenditure should be defrayed by the British Exchequer. Whilst dealing with this subject I may say that there are several returns which I asked for again and again but have not yet obtained. If the right hon. gentleman will give us those returns we shall be able to judge as to the real material condition of the people of India. Till those returns are made we shall never be in such a position. Whilst sitting at the meeting some time ago on the subject of the Armenian atrocities, I admired very highly the efforts that the English always make for the protection of the oppressed or the mitigation of their sufferings. May I appeal to the same British people that they will also consider the case of the people of India. Millions on millions in India are living in a state of semi-starvation. When the British people have the information which will enable them to realise that they will surely have some compassion on their own fellow-subjects and look into the matter carefully. They will surely ask why, after a hundred years of administration by most highly praised and highly paid officials, the condition of India is such that India is not able to pay even one-thirteenth part of that taxation which the people of Ireland, poor Ireland pay. This is not to your glory. (Hear, hear.) Are you satisfied with such results? While your wealth has gone on increasing by leaps and bounds we, according to the declaration of the Secretary for India, have not one-twentieth the capacity of Englishmen for taxation. You pay in drink more than £3 to £4 a head. We cannot even produce anything like that amount. Our whole production is not two pounds a head, or, if you take the present rate of exchange, it is only 20s. Such should not be the result of that system which has been expected to be a beneficial system. We should be in a position which, if it were not so good as yours, should still be a position of prosperity. The late Mr. John Bright once said, "There are two ways of benefitting ourselves —one by plunder, and the other by trade." And he said that he preferred the method of trade. But you do not follow that principle. You bleed us; and you cannot whilst you do that benefit yourselves in any real sense—you cannot certainly have a large trade. What is the extent of the trade of this country with India? It is a most miserable quantity. The amount of British produce sent to India is hardly worth 2s. per head, per annum, of the population of India, while if India were prosperous you would have a very good trade indeed. You would not then have any necessity to complain about these cotton duties, and about the want of a market. (Hear, hear.) You seek a market among the poor African savages—(Oh!)— in order to create more markets for yourselves, but there in India is a market of three hundred millions of civilised people, and if you allowed them to develop their resources you would not have to complain. You might then eliminate the word "unemployed" from your dictionaries. You would hardly be able to meet the largeness of their demands. If only we took what was equal to £1 per head of the population of India, you would be able to export to us as much as you are exporting to the whole world at present, and you would have our blessing upon it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the other day that where injustice and wrong prevail as they have prevailed in Armenia, a Liberal Government always called upon and obtained the co-operation of the European powers in order to redress the wrong. May I appeal to you to extend similar consideration to the condition of India also. The right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian made a very noble speech on his birthday in reference to the Armenians. I need not quote it. But I appeal to him and all who are of like mind with him that they will give consideration to those to whom they are more tied by duty—who are their fellow-subjects. Let them show that they do not think that we should be treated as mere helots—that they do not think that we should be bled; that the evils do not exist because of the intention of British people, but because of the official system which has been so deeply rooted in the country, and that they will do their best to put the system on the lines of justice. (Hear, hear.) I ask for no charity—for no subsidy. (Hear, hear.) I ask for common justice. I ask that if we are indeed partners with you and derive a proportion of benefit we should pay in proportion to the benefit. The next part of my amendment is with regard to any expenditure which may be incurred outside the boundaries of India. If you conquer Burma, or go to Siam or China, you should not make us pay. When the Burmese war was declared, we sent a telegram to the Viceroy that the war should be considered as a war on your own account. We say the same now in respect to any warlike expenditure beyond our borderland. Certainly whenever such a thing takes place, you are bound in justice to defray at least half of the expenditure. You have already in one case admitted and acted on that principle. During the last Afghan War, which was certainly not only for the sake of the protection of British India, but also of British rule, with regard to the expenses of that war, Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Gladstone fought for the expenditure not

to be wholly put upon India, and when the Liberal Government afterwards came in it was decided that at any rate a portion—one-fourth—of the expenditure should be defrayed from the British Exchequer. That in these cases the whole expenditure should be thrown upon India is not worthy of British honour. I therefore appeal with every confidence. Whatever may be the difference of opinion with regard to various Indian matters, on this one point of expenditure which is for the benefit of both—and often, as it has been pointed out, a great deal more for your benefit than for ours—a portion, say one-half, of the expenditure on the European services should be paid by the British Exchequer. I hope that I shall not appeal in vain. Indeed I know that whenever any appeal is made on the principle of justice and honour, the British people will fairly and fully respond to it. (Hear, hear.) I will not take up more of the House's time. I am much obliged to members of the House for the very kind attention which they have given to me. (Hear, hear.) I will only make one more remark by way of illustration. It is with regard to this question of the import duty. That again illustrates our helpless condition. What is this import duty? The British Indian Government by one stroke of the pen ordered a million of money to be given to the well-to-do European services from the wretchedness of the poor Indians. But to order that million to be paid and to get the money were two different things, and the British Indian Government said, like Lord Salisbury, that as the rural population had already been bled they had better now bleed some portion of the well-to-do. That could only be done by this kind of duty. But the Indian Government saw that it would be an indirect way of bleeding the Native States also. This will be a transit duty. Different kinds of goods imported into India must go through British ports, and some of the goods passing through them into the Native States will be obliged to pay some of the duty. I am not, however, discussing the subject of the duty itself. That question is to be separately brought forward, and then I shall be able to say what I have to say on that subject. All I wish to point out is the gravity of the situation as regards the taxing of India. The Government of India say, "we wish to bleed India in this part." The Lancashire people say, "No, you must bleed in this other part." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And thus we have the unseemly squabble. Unfortunately, while we have no voice we cannot touch or restrict the expenditure a single farthing. The Government are arbitrary and can do what they like. We have what is called a Legislative Council where the Budget is produced, but we must accept it. We have no voice in determining its character. My present appeal, therefore, is for justice, for righteousness. If certain advantages are derived by India from the British rule, and certain advantages obtained by Great Britain from that rule, the cost of the respective advantages should be fairly shared by both. That is the course which alone will be worthy of the British people. Again, I say I hope that I shall not make this appeal in vain. (Cheers.)

Sir William Wedderburn: I beg to second the amendment of my hon. friend, and at the same time I must express my great regret in similar terms that no reference to India has been made in the course of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech. The people of India are in a condition of extreme anxiety as to what the nature will be of the promised financial inquiry to which reference was made at the close of last Session. They are anxious to know whether that inquiry is really to go to the root of the matter; whether it will be a genuine attempt to learn the true causes of, and to apply a real remedy to, the disastrous financial condition of the country. (Hear, hear.) In this anxiety we may truly say many members of this House share. (Hear, hear.) I would particularly refer to those hon. gentlemen who represent Lancashire constituencies—(hear, hear)—because they are deeply interested in Indian finance in relation to the imposition of duties upon Lancashire goods. It cannot be too distinctly understood that the imposition of these import duties is a direct result of the excessive expenditure—administrative expenditure in India. The imposition of this new tax is simply one incident in the downward course of Indian finance. It is one of the stages of the rake's career. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) We have had one or two other notable stages in that career. We have had the closing of the mints which has convulsed exchanges all over the civilised world, and we have had the misappropriation of the Famine Fund which was designed to relieve the distress of the starving people. Therefore, I would ask the hon. members for Lancashire to say that this excessive expenditure should stop, and then the necessity for import duties, whether on cotton or anything else, would cease. (Hear, hear.) I think other hon. members are also very much interested to know the terms of this reference. I think that members who are interested in India, and may perhaps be asked to take a part in this Select Committee would like to know whether this inquiry is to be one of real benefit to India and to this country. (Hear, hear.) I do not think that they will be very willing to give their time and their labour if it is to be a mere book-keeping enquiry. (Hear, hear.) If it is to be of no more value than these bogus audits of the Liberator type—("Oh" and laughter)—I do not think that hon. members will be willing to give their labour to it. We do not want a mere bogus audit at all. We want to go into the whole facts of the case—to know what are the causes of the financial difficulty and what are the real remedies by which the finances of India can be put on a good and sound basis. (Hear, hear.) And in order to get at the real facts, we challenge inquiry upon certain points. We make four important propositions, and we invite my right hon. friend the Secretary of State to allow us to prove those propositions, or do our best to do so. These are the following. The first is that the condition of the people of India is one of extreme poverty. The second is that the burden of taxation is crushing the people of India, and is more than they can bear. The third is that the proceeds of this taxation are being employed upon useless and mischievous frontier wars, and the fourth is that if this useless military expenditure were stopped, it would not be necessary to impose import duties—that it would be possible even to remove a certain amount of the existing taxation, and to provide funds to meet extreme needs in the way of famine, and for the progress and welfare of the Indian people. (Hear, hear.) How does the Secretary of State deal with these propositions? How does he propose to deal with this great question of the condition of the Indian people? We think it a very dreadful thing here in this country—in London—that there should be a submerged tenth, but in India we have a submerged fifth—a fifth of the people who have only one meal a day. As has been stated, they never have their hunger satisfied. How has the Secretary of State met this demand for inquiry into the condition of the people. He refuses to go into the question of revenue altogether, and he has only offered us an inquiry into expenditure. It appears to me that the proper logical course is to take income first and expenditure afterwards. (Hear, hear.) It seems a very curious thing to inquire how much we ought to spend before we know how much we have got to spend. If a private individual is in pecuniary difficulties and wants to get his affairs put straight, he first ascertains what his income is. If he is a large landowner, he ascertains whether his farmers can pay their rents, and after finding out what he may reasonably expect his income to be, he is able to decide what his expenditure can reasonably be. In the same way as regards India—we do not deny that a fair amount of value has been received, but we say that the expenditure is upon a scale too large for India. We say that India should cut her coat according to her cloth. When the right hon. gentleman enables us to ascertain how much income she really and properly has we shall be able to say how much she can reasonably spend. Therefore we very much regret that the India Office declines to go into the question of the revenue, and to enable us to judge of the capacity of the Indian people to bear taxation, or of the amount of taxation that can reasonably be raised from India. I think that this inquiry is all the more necessary—and I say it with great regret—because my right hon. friend appears to be possessed with such a spirit of optimism, and to take such a very rosy view of the condition of the Indian taxpayer, and also of the financial condition of the people of India. It appears to me that to take any such optimistic view is a dangerous delusion. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend the member for Finsbury (Mr. Naoroji) pointed out that the maximum estimate of the average income of the Indian people was 27 rupees per head, or something like 1½d. a day. What is there out of that to tax? (Hear, hear.) Where is the surplus that you can tax? You must remember the great rayat class. They have no savings. They, in fact, have less than nothing because they are terribly in debt to the village money-lender, and have no reserve of food at all. A single failure in the harvest produces starvation and death by hunger to hundreds of thousands and even to millions of these people. How are a people like that to bear taxation? And

how are they to be said to be lightly taxed if they are paying nearly double in proportion to what is paid by the inhabitants of this wealthy country, who, as we know, themselves find it hard enough to pay as it is. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, we say that the condition of the Indian people cries loudly for most careful inquiry. And I think my right hon. friend takes, similarly, a too favourable view of the financial condition of the Government of India. He has said that it is absurd to talk about its being insolvent, although we know it is very difficult to find money to pay current expenses; and I would draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to a very interesting and authoritative article in the *Nineteenth Century* by Sir Auckland Colvin, the former Minister of Finance for India, in which he says that unless this military expenditure on aggressive operations is stopped there will be only three alternatives before the Indian Government. Those alternatives are either that the British Treasury should come in to help, or that the people should be further taxed, in addition to their existing taxes, or else that the Indian Government should be declared bankrupt. Those are the three alternatives which he puts before us, and I think in face of that it can hardly be safe to take a rosy view of Indian finance. As regards the state of that finance I will only state one fact which will show to the House the dire straits in which the Government of India now are. That fact is that they have imposed the import duties which are giving such very great dissatisfaction throughout the important district of Lancashire. I do not suppose anyone will think that Ministers of the Crown would be willing to excite the anger of Lancashire members if they had not found that it was impossible otherwise to meet their liabilities. They must have squeezed the Indian people pretty dry before they came and asked Manchester to help them with money. And in this connection I hope I may be excused if I say one word to the hon. members who sit for Lancashire divisions, and if I beg them to be so good as to consider the unfortunate position of the Indian taxpayer in this matter. The Indian taxpayer does not want to have import duties imposed. He has asked to have them, but only as the lesser of two evils, because, as has been pointed out, the import duties will fall chiefly upon the wealthier classes, and also because they constitute an indirect tax which causes a minimum of of oppression in its collection. The taxpayers of India, I repeat, are only asking to have the form of taxation which will be the least painful to them. They prefer to be chastised with whips rather than with scorpions; and they beg as a matter of favour to be allowed to pay 5 per cent upon their imported goods rather than to have an increase of the duty upon salt, which is now 4,000 per cent. upon a commodity which is consumed every day by the very poorest of the poor. Therefore, I would say to the members who represent Lancashire constituencies, Do not use all your great influence to secure that the burden, which must be borne by these poor people, shall be imposed in the way that will be the most killing, the most maiming, the most crushing to the poorest classes among them." I would appeal to the great and noble policy that is connected with the names of Manchester and of Mr. John Bright, who was the friend of India first, and of all other interests afterwards; and I would ask the hon. members of Lancashire divisions to attain their object, which is the same object as ours, by joining hands with us in asking for a reduction of expenditure which is making these import duties necessary. If they will help us to reduce the expenditure they will gain the gratitude of the whole of India and will make unnecessary import duties on cotton goods or anything else. My appeal to have this reduction of expenditure is based on the contention that it is actually mischievous; because in carrying on the aggressive expeditions which make it necessary, we are abandoning the good old safe policy of Lord Lawrence. The policy of Lord Lawrence was that India ought to remain within her natural bounds and barriers, and that the basis for a safe defence of India lay in the contentment of the people themselves, in friendly neighbours, and in a full treasury. But the effect of these aggressions beyond the frontier is that we have an empty treasury, that we have filled our neighbours with fear and hatred and that within our borders we have people who are overtaxed and consequently more or less discontented. Therefore we say, let us stop this policy and revert to the good old policy formerly pursued, and then India will be as prosperous as my hon. friend has prophesied—and not only will she be prosperous herself, but she will be the cause of prosperity among the toiling millions of this country. I beg to second the amendment.

Mr. FOWLER: There was one sentence in the speech of my hon. friend, the mover of the amendment, in which I cordially agree. He stated that India asks for no charity, no subvention, but that her claim is for justice; and I can assure him that this Government, the Government which preceded it, and I am satisfied the Government which may follow it, will, as English statesmen, have no wish but to treat India with the strictest, I may say, the most generous, justice. My hon. friend said he made his motion in no party spirit. I believe and accept that statement, and I can conceive no greater calamity that could happen to Indian interests and to our Indian Empire than that it should ever be one of the shuttlecocks with which the party game of battledore is played. (Hear, hear.) We want to keep party out of Indian affairs altogether. (Cheers.) The people of this country have undertaken or have had placed upon them a great trust; and I believe, in direct opposition to the statement of the mover and seconder of this amendment, that the first has hitherto been faithfully discharged, has been justly discharged, and has been honourably discharged. (Hear, hear.) I believe it has conferred unspeakable benefits upon the people of India, and though no one is more ready than I am to admit that there are many points in which improvement is desirable and that there are many spheres in which financial reform can be wisely extended, in which expenditure can be reduced, and in which increased efficiency can be secured, yet I must express my strong dissent alike from the facts and the figures and the conclusions of my two hon. friends who have brought this motion forward. I am sure that my hon. friend the mover of the resolution did not even himself believe that at the present day the people of India are, under British rule, suffering grosser outrages and more acute wrongs than those it is alleged the people of Armenia suffer under Turkish rule; and I would put it to him, as to a friend of India and one who desires, as he has told us, to secure perfectly amicable relations between these two great Empires, whether he thinks it is wise for him to use in the British House of Commons words—words which will no doubt be translated and transmitted for the reading of the whole of the people of India—indicating that there is a man in this House who actually believes that the people of India are at this moment suffering at the hands of the Queen-Empress and her officers wrongs which can be compared if only in a thousandth degree, to those which the people of Armenia are alleged to be suffering at the present time at the hands of the Turks. (Hear, hear.) I am sure that was a mistake on the part of my hon. friend, and consequently I will pass it by; and I will also pass by all his allusions to what he calls a conquered people, and his suggestion that they are treated as slaves and helots. That is not, I believe, the the opinion of the people of India, I am sure it is not in harmony with the facts of the case. (Hear, hear.) But my hon. friend gave us two or three sets of figures; and perhaps after inquiring into the accuracy of those figures, I may be regarded as justified in criticising to some extent the accuracy of his conclusions. It is in reference to those figures that so largely incorrect views are put before the public mind, but I will only call attention to two or three statements which my hon. friend made in the course of his speech. In the first place he said we were dealing with an expenditure of seventy millions. Now I drew the attention of the House last year to the fact that those very large sums include a great variety of incomes and expenditures which have no application to public expenditure and taxation as we understand those words in this country. If you were to include in the English Budget the whole of the rents of the United Kingdom, the traffic receipts of every railway and every canal, and an enormous amount of public works which in themselves produce an income that discharges the entire cost of their construction, you would pile up the English Budget from a hundred millions to a thousand millions—(Hear, hear)—and then you might say you had such a sum to deal with. Now I ventured to submit to the House six months ago, that no one can deny the statement that the real net revenue and expenditure of India are about fifty millions, and not what my hon. friend mentioned. I was specially sorry to hear him say what I will next refer to, because it is a statement which may be misunderstood, and may produce in many minds a feeling of the existence of extravagant injustice. Though the statement has at first sight some justification it is not based on the facts of the case. My hon. friend told the House that out

of the revenue of India the people were called upon to pay Rx. 20,000,000 to English officials. The conclusion that any-one would draw from that statement would be that the ordinary civil expenditure of the Government of India includes something like that sum for salaries. Let me tell the House exactly what was the cost of the establishment in India some six years ago, when the figures were taken. The cost of our Civil Establish-ment at that time was Rx. 11,726,000, and of that sum over six millions was paid to natives.

MR. NAOROJI: We have a return of the salaries of a thousand rupees and upwards paid to officials; and from that return and from correspondence I have had with the Office itself, it will be found that all the salaries and pensions will come to nearly two hundred million rupees.

MR. FOWLER: I can only express my dissent from those figures. I come down to officers receiving 250 rupees, which practically covers the whole Civil Service of India. I would here mention another fact which, perhaps, is not very germane to the matter before us; but, in view of the statements made from time to time to the effect that the entire administration of India is entrusted to Europeans, it will be interesting if I give the House the proportions of that large army of public servants, Europeans and Natives, who discharge their duties with so much care, ability and efficiency. There are 7,991 Europeans, 5,347 Eurasians, and 119,514 Natives.

MR. NAOROJI: What do you pay to each?

MR. FOWLER: Let me go on to another statement which my hon. friend made, and which was, to a certain extent, endorsed by the seconder of the amendment—a statement with reference to the incidence of taxation. I did not understand my hon. friend to give correctly the answer I returned to the hon. member for Flintshire. I think the hon. member for Flint-shire asked me whether I excluded the land revenue when I stated that the taxation of India was the figure which has been quoted. Well, I do not any more consider the land revenue taxation than I consider the rent of any man's house taxation; and I have the authority of John Stuart Mill and Professor Fawcett upon the point. That being so, how much of this taxation falls upon the people of India, that is, of this fifty millions I have been talking about? There are in India tax and non-tax revenue. You must again divide the fifty millions by one half to get to the tax revenue, and when we are told that the people of India are unable to pay their taxation I can only repeat to the House what I said last year, that the only tax which an Indian peasant need pay—and I am sorry he has to pay that—is the tax upon salt. I have never for a moment defended that tax; I said last year that I should be exceedingly glad to see it repealed, and, like the seconder of the Resolution, who spoke so confidently as to what the Indian public desire, I am satisfied that if our expenditure admitted of a reduction of taxation, the Indian nation would demand not the repeal of the customs duties but rather the repeal of the salt tax which presses so heavily upon the poorer classes of the people. The salt tax, which everybody in India is obliged to pay, amounts to 5 annas, or 5d., per head. Next, my hon friend referred to the Navy, and said it was a monstrous thing that India should have to contribute towards the cost of that Service. I wish my hon. friend knew something of the inner life of the India Office on this question. There is a great controversy going on between the India Office and the Admiralty and the Treasury with reference to the contribution which the first-named should make to the Navy; and so acute has become the difference of opinion between my right hon. friends the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the First Lord of the Admiralty and myself that we have referred the matter to arbitration. (Laughter.) Origin-ally we had hoped that a very distinguished member of the other House, the Duke of Devonshire, would have been able to under-take the task of arbitrating between us; but he has been unable to undertake the duty, and we have agreed to refer it to one in whom we have the greatest confidence, whose judgment we shall be bound to respect, and who will look on all the points involved with the greatest justice and judgment—the matter is now referred to the decision of the Prime Minister. Now let me give the House the figures. We are contributing now—the India Office are paying—£50,000 and no more for what we may call the police of the Indian Seas. I am not going to say too much about that, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer may say that I am using a very good argument why we should pay more; but my hon. friend says: "You have no such thing as Indian commerce; it is the commerce of Great Britain;" and he drew a glowing picture of the state of affairs which would come into being if England were expelled from India, when there would be an enormous trade in India. I do not know what the trade of India was before the East India Company was there, and I will not trouble the House by stating what the figures were 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 years ago; but, dealing with the value of merchandise imported into, and exported from, British India by sea from and to foreign ports, excluding Government stores, excluding all the fearful drain which we are told India suffers as a result of British government, I find that in the year 1892-3, which was not a particularly prosperous year, India bought £79,000,000 worth sterling of merchandise and India sold £113,000,000 worth. If that is what my hon. friend calls "no Indian commerce" my ideas of what is com-merce differ widely from his. Before coming to the amendment itself, let me say a word or two in reply to the speech of the seconder, who, I am bound to say, did not very accurately approach the wording of the amendment itself. He first charged us with having, by closing the mints, convulsed the exchanges of the world. I am not going to open the bimetallic question this evening. I will spare myself and spare the House, and I am almost afraid even to utter my next sentence for fear it should prove a temptation to someone who may follow me to embark upon that troubled sea. But do not bring me in with Lancashire, with the exchanges of the world, or with my friends on the other side who think we ought to have pursued a different currency policy. All I wish to say is that the closing of the mints has been a great pecuniary advantage to India. Since I have been in office I have had the figures taken out month by month of the coining or melting value of the rupee and of its currency value, and the percentage be-tween the two is one of those accurate uniform laws which seem to pervade the whole realm of statistics—which you can wonder at and note, but which you cannot define. Practi-cally it has not varied during the whole of that period anything like a fraction per cent. There has been one uniform difference of 20 per cent., or 19 and a decimal very nearly approaching that figure—which the Govern-ment of India has received more for its Bills through the closing of the mints. Up to the end of January I should have been nearly two and a quarter million worse off than I am if those mints had not been closed, and that money would of course have had to be found from some other source of taxation. Then my hon. friend made another remark which I think was not warranted and was not just to the House or just to himself. We had last year a very full debate upon the Famine Fund. I know there are those who contend that the surplus of revenue over expenditure ought not to be applied to any purpose except purposes connected with famine and famine relief works and productive railway and irrigation works. No one knows better than my hon. friend that the vast scheme of works which was contemplated ten or twelve years ago are now com-pleted, and that nothing further of a large character is needed at present. They have been provided for out of that fund, But the hon. member used the words "misappropriation of the Famine Fund." I am not the Finance Minister of India, but I am the representative in this House of that Finance Minister, and I say that this is a phrase which ought not to be used in regard to the head of any Finance Depart-ment unless the user of it is prepared to prove it up to the very hilt. (Cheers.) "Misappropriation" is a very ugly word to use in connection with finance. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend compared the Committee which we have offered, and which we are anxious to see sitting, to a bogus audit. What does that mean? I do not know. Does it mean dishonest auditors auditing accounts dishonestly and giving a dishonest report of what has been done? I do not see any similarity between a bogus auditor and a Committee of this House, and I cannot accept the very severe and harsh criticisms which my hon. friend has passed upon this offer. These are the general features of the case. What is it that my hon. friend the mover of this resolution asks? He asks that Her Majesty will be pleased to direct the Government "to so adjust the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British Indian services, civil and military, in this country and in India"—therefore, I suppose, that includes every British soldier and every British civilian—"that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer in proportion to the pecuniary and political benefits accruing to the United Kingdom from your

gracious Majesty's sway over India." If the amendment had stopped at the words British Exchequer, I do not mean to say that that would not be a question deserving of inquiry, though I do not understand my hon. friend's constitutional mode of attaining his object, for he is proposing a serious change in the Government policy in India, and it would require the authority of an Act of Parliament and not of a minister to make it. Then my hon. friend goes on: "And that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned." What is to be the tribunal which is to accurately adjust the balance and to say what is a "fair and equitable portion?"

An hon. member: The Duke of Devonshire.

Mr. H. Fowler: My hon. friend suggests the Duke of Devonshire, but I do not know whether he, or I, or anybody, would take the liberty. No one man or any ordinary number of men could determine a question so difficult as the pecuniary and political benefits derived between two parts of a great Empire for the mother country. (Hear, hear.) I do not for a moment say that we have not derived great benefits from our connection in India. But at the same time India has derived great benefits from her connection with England. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend in the course of his speech states that that there was no capital for improving the condition of the people of India. Where did the capital come from which constructed the Indian railways and the Indian canals, which have changed the whole face of India and conferred such benefits upon civilisation as have not been conferred on any other country in Asia. (Cheers.) I dare say that no other country in the world in so short a period of time has got so much from British capital. (Cheers.) It has come from here, it is British capital.

Mr. W. S. Caine: And from Indian taxes.

Mr. H. Fowler: I hope my hon. friend the member for Bradford will abstain from these interruptions. I carefully abstain from interrupting him. (Hear, hear.) I do not know whether my hon. friend wishes to penalise the employment of Europeans. He speaks of the employment as if it were a crime and a calamity that Europeans have taken part in the administration of the country. That, I do not think, will be the opinion of this House. (Hear, hear.) I do not think it will be the opinion either of England or of India that the distinguished, I will not say generals, but distinguished soldiers and civilians and that vast army of English public servants who have, during the last century been carrying on the affairs of India are a class of men of which this country has reason to be ashamed or of which India has any ground of complaint. (Cheers and interruptions). My hon. friend who dissents can deal with the point when he gets up to reply to me. It is not fair for him to interrupt me in the course of my speech as he is doing, I have not the experience in making public speeches which my hon. friend has—(laughter)—and I think that if he were subjected to these interruptions, even he would feel at some disadvantage. (Hear, hear.) Now what is practically the proposal of the resolution? We are asked to agree to some apportionment between the two countries. Coming to the practical part of the controversy, I am quite ready to admit that very serious differences have arisen between England and India; between, in fact, the two Exchequers, with reference to this apportionment, not on the principles of pecuniary and political benefit, but on the wider principle of justice between the two countries. Personally I am not at all prepared to dissent from a great many of the conclusions at which my hon. friend arrived. (Hear, hear.) This is not the first time that this question has been raised. I may remind my hon. friend that a Committee sat a great many years ago at the instance of Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Fawcett recommended a careful consideration of the question. Immediately after that Committee broke up, which was in 1874, a Departmental Committee was appointed of which the late Mr. Bouverie was chairman, but the report of that Committee was so unfavourable, and as India thought, so unjust, that it was practically impossible either for the Government here to impose, or for India to accept, the proposed returns. That was the result of that inquiry. Immediately after that had failed, India still being dissatisfied, and I think justly dissatisfied with this apportionment of what are called Home Charges, a departmental inquiry took place under the auspices of the present Lord Derby who was then Financial Secretary to the Treasury, the Committee including Lord Northbrook and Mr. Knox of the War Office. That Committee had the subject under consideration for fourteen years and during that period it issued a long series of reports, every one being accepted both by the Exchequer and by the India Office. But I should be deceiving the House if I did not say that Lord Northbrook when the Commission closed was dissatisfied with the state of matters, and that the Duke of Argyll, certainly no small authority on these matters, was also dissatisfied, he being at that time Secretary of State. If the House will allow me I will quote the remarks of my own predecessor, Lord Kimberley, upon this question, to show that this is no party question, and that Secretaries of State like the Duke of Argyll and Lord Kimberley and a Viceroy like Lord Northbrook were agreed that there is a substantial, reasonable, and just ground of complaint as between India and England in reference to the question of military costs. This is what Lord Kimberley said in the House of Lords: "Upon this question of general policy which I have been invited to discuss, I do not think it at all safe to express very confident views. As to the share that India should bear of the expenses of expeditions out of that country, it appears to me that if India is really interested in an expedition it is right that that country should contribute a fair amount towards the cost of it. It is impossible to decide upon such matters beforehand. They must be dealt with at the time. All I can say is that we think India should be fairly and generously dealt with, and not charged with the cost of these expeditions unless she has a distinct interest in them. With regard to Egypt, for instance, India has a very considerable interest. . . . The question of Military Charges is incapable of any complete solution; but it is one which I am quite certain successive Viceroys and Secretaries of State will continue to press upon the Home Government—that is, that we should not have to bear so large a share of the Army expenses. We must try to reduce them, but I am not very sanguine that we shall be able to do so. We shall not fail at the India Office to do our utmost to keep these charges within a reasonable amount. I should like to quote what the Duke of Argyll said as to the real gravamen of the charge. He said: "We have only to consider what India would have been but for English rule to see the enormous benefit she has derived from it. It is no exaggeration to say that our government of India is such a government as the world has never seen before. The Roman Empire in its greatest extent was not so wonderful. We govern 180,000,000 men of opposite races and religions, sometimes fanatically opposed to each other, and governed them more quietly, calmly, and peacefully than we could govern our own people in Ireland. I desire to say nothing which would diminish the loyalty and sense of obligation which the Indian people feel and ought to feel towards us; and it would have the worst possible effect if there were any suspicion aroused in India that, for the purposes of making convenient Budgets or of party government, the people of India were being charged with expenses which ought really to be defrayed by the Home Government." That is really the chief point of my hon. friend's complaint. The amendment asks me to direct an apportionment of certain military charges between England and India.

Mr. Naoroji: Not merely the Military Charges but also the Home Charges.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Well, I am sorry there is not the common ground between my friend and myself that I thought there was. I know of no case being made out in reference to the Home Charges. I do think there is a case with reference to the military expenditure. I was last year asked that there should be an inquiry as to that. My hon. friend the member for Banffshire asked for a committee of inquiry into the condition of the people of India, into the burdens of taxation, and into the question of general expenditure. I said last Session, in reply to the hon. member for the Forest of Dean, that the Government did not mean to have an inquiry by a committee of the House of Commons into the whole policy of the Indian Government. (Cheers.) That is impracticable, and it would be useless. The Imperial policy which one Cabinet after another may have pursued in India is a question which, if it be wrong, must be brought before Parliament and before this House. The Cabinet is responsible to Parliament and to the House of Commons, but for a Select Committee upstairs to inquire into the wisdom of the policy say of the annexation of

Burma, or into the question of the fortifications of the North-West frontier, or with reference to the delimitation of the boundaries between India and Afghanistan, all these are questions of imperial policy. They are not questions for a Select Committee. (Hear.) I do not want to deceive my hon. friend. I not only do not mean to ask the House to allow such an inquiry, but I will carefully, to the best of my ability, guard against the possibility of such an inquiry being granted. I say there is need for inquiry into the expenditure. (Cheers.) Some people think there is no ground of complaint, but when there is a general impression that the expenditure is extravagant it is unwise not to bring the question to the test of public criticism. Those who think that an unfair share of the Home Charges is thrown upon the Indian Exchequer should have the opportunity of having the matter threshed out before a Committee of both Houses, or by some other mode of inquiry competent to deal with the question. But after the experience we have had, and the utter breakdown of all these Committees on Indian affairs—Committees which have endeavoured to cover the whole range of Indian politics, I for one will be no party to asking this House to embark on any such fresh inquiry. The Government are anxious and desirous that there should be a fair, full, and complete inquiry in the direction I have indicated. We have not yet finally decided the mode in which the inquiry should proceed. My hon. friend the member for Banffshire last year proposed to me the appointment of a Royal Commission. I objected to it then as I thought it too cumbrous and expensive a mode of procedure. I preferred myself, and my Parliamentary instincts led me to prefer, a Parliamentary inquiry. (Hear.) But I am bound to say that very strong reasons have been urged on my notice since then why a Parliamentary inquiry would not, perhaps in the circumstances, be the best. A Parliamentary inquiry of necessity ceases when the existing Parliament ceases to exist, and it certainly would be impossible to get an inquiry—a satisfactory inquiry—brought to a conclusion in one Session of Parliament. Accidents sometimes happen to Parliaments: they do not necessarily last a certain number of Sessions: they may come to an end. Accidents, too, sometimes happen to right hon. and hon. members of Parliament: they may not be members of the next Parliament, and hon. gentlemen interested in Indian affairs and very competent to express an opinion upon them, may not be members of the next Parliament. It has been urged upon me I ought to consider, before finally submitting the question to the House of Commons, whether it would not be desirable to have an impartial, small, but thoroughly efficient, Royal Commission, in order to inquire into the whole circumstances. That is a question on which I do not, at the present time, nor is it necessary I should, express any opinion. All I can say with reference to the amendment of my hon. friend as it stands is that it is an unconstitutional and incompetent amendment. The Queen cannot direct her Ministers to repeal an Act of Parliament. That must be done by Parliament and by no one else. With reference to the opinion he has expressed that a "fair and adequate" portion of the expenditure should be borne by the Home Exchequer, we are quite willing that such an inquiry should be held and we are content to abide by its result. I, therefore, hope that my hon. friend will not press this matter to a division, if he does I shall be compelled to vote against him, and I should be sorry in that way to cast some doubt on the desirability of this inquiry. Whatever may be our financial views, whatever may be the opinion of the House, and I am not going to touch on the question of the import duties on cotton, that I shall be prepared to discuss when the proper time comes, now is not the time for the question is not raised by this amendment. Whatever may be the opinion of the House as to whether our policy has been wise or unwise I claim for my colleagues not only in the Government but also those in the India Office and Indian Council, men of great experience and knowledge in Indian affairs, and in sympathy with the best administration of those affairs, an equal desire not to oppress India, not to bleed India, not to injure India, but to go on in that grand career of progress which has hitherto characterised the rule of India by Great Britain, in the belief that that rule has conferred upon the people of India an unspeakable boon while it has rebounded in no small degree to the glory and honour of the United Kingdom. (Loud Cheers.)

SIR D. MACFARLANE: I quite agree with my right hon. friend that the hon. member who moved this amendment has not made out a case for such an inquiry to the extent he has indicated. It would be strange indeed if the Government had not been guilty of some mistakes, but I venture to say that no case has been made out which justifies the terms used by my hon. friend. I have myself been for several years pressing for such an inquiry as the right hon. gentleman has expressed his willingness to grant, and by question as well as by notice of motion I have urged that there should be a Committee or a Commission to show to the people of India that which they do not know, and I am afraid do not believe, that we are treating them equitably and fairly in the matter of Home Charges. (Hear.) I am not going to make any charge against successive governments. But it is desirable that if the policy be just it should be made known to be so to the people of India, while if it be unjust then the people at home should be made acquainted with the fact. There is one point I should like to refer to, even though it be deemed to be a small matter, and that is the throwing upon the revenues of India a portion of the charges incurred on the Opium Commission. It is such small affairs as these which indicate the way the wind blows. The people of India did not ask for the Commission, it was obnoxious to most of them, and it was thrust upon them by a certain number of hon. gentlemen who were not aware what the consequences would be if they attempted to interfere with the habits of the natives, and who thought they could deal with Opium as with Local Veto. They were not aware that such interference might lead to grave disturbance if not to insurrection. I agree with the right hon. gentlemen in the tribute he has paid to the work done by the great civil and military services in India. Nothing can surpass the high character of these services. At the same time it may be said, and I think perhaps with some truth, that possibly in these times as good men could be secured for less remuneration. (Hear). There might be some trifling saving in that direction, but I am not sure it would be worthy consideration. If there is one thing desirable it is that every British official in India should be beyond reproach. There is always great difficulty experienced in checking the tyranny of the native police, and half the time of the district officers is taken up in trying to prevent these native officials from oppressing the Indians. We have to a large extent succeeded in our rule in India; we have saved the country from the continual wars and troubles which used to affect it, and it is as safe now for a poor man to walk about in any part as it is in England. That is a thing to be proud of, especially when we consider what India was until we made our appearance there. (Cheers). I do not deny that we ourselves have derived considerable advantages from our occupation of the country—(hear, hear)—but the advantage is not by any means all on one side. The natives may think that they pay too much, and if they have done so it should be paid back to them. (Hear). I do not agree with the views of my hon. friend as to the excessive nature of the general charges. The greatest blessing ever conferred on India was when Englishman landed there. (hear, hear) We administer it to the best of our ability and with justice and fairness, and we have succeeded in a way no other country in the world ever succeeded. By all means let us have this Commission appointed, let us go into the question whether there is anything now charged on India which should be paid by the Imperial Exchequer, and if so let the change be made. We have no wish to be unjust in any way. It is the desire of every one of us to contribute as far as possible to the welfare of the people of India—(cheers)—and whatever is to their advantage will be equally to the advantage of the people of England. (Hear, hear.) No body of public men in the world ever administered a country with a more honest desire to benefit the people than the British civil and military services have done in India, and if my hon. friend gets the Commission he asks for, I hope he will succeed in all his legitimate desires. (Cheers.)

MR. SEYMOUR KEAY: I do not want to detain the House at any length on this occasion, and I do not think I should have intervened in this debate at all had it not been that the figures quoted by the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State for India, made me see at once that he had made a great mistake. He spoke about the comparative insignificance of the number of European servants and the pecuniary amounts paid for the services rendered, and he seemed to me to state figures which ought to be multiplied three or four times over in order to get at the truth. I know how probably the mistake occurred, because none of these returns are ever summed up, and unless some one is employed on the labourious task of summing up the columns, it is easy to understand how a wrong result may

be arrived at. With regard to the number of Europeans in India, it is only three years ago that a return was laid on the Table of this House on my motion by the Secretary of State for India, and there we have the whole thing in black and white. I will merely, therefore, in the briefest possible way, state the real figures of the number of Europeans and emoluments paid them. Reckoning those who have salaries of over £100 a year, or to speak more accurately, of 1,000 rupees a year, the return shows that instead of 7,000 Europeans as stated by the right hon. gentlemen, there are no less than 28,000, and the amount of money which these 28,000 Europeans receive, aggregates no less than 154 million rupees. The hon. member for Central Finsbury said he estimated the whole of the amount paid to Europeans in salaries at Rs. 200,000,000. I do not know if he was including the cost of the rank and file of the British army; but if that is the case certainly his figure is under the mark instead of over it. The return given on my motion only shows the salaries over 1,000 rupees a year, and the hon. gentleman says he has included those of 250 rupees instead of 1,000 rupees. There is no doubt the amount shown by my return, namely, Rs. 154,000,000 a year is decidedly under the mark. Then there is an additional fact which bears upon the motion before the House. Where are those Rs.154,000,000 received, and where are they expended? Of the Rs.154,000,000 the same return shows that no less than Rs.60,000,000 are remitted to be spent in England in the shape of pensions; that is to say that 40 per cent. of the whole of the amount disbursed in salaries of over 1,000 rupees a year to Europeans who have belonged to the Indian Service is remitted to and disbursed in England. Contrast that with what we find to be the case with regard to the natives. The natives are shown by the same return to be employed in their own country only to the number of 11,000 persons, that is to say in positions worth over 1,000 rupees a year. Amongst these 11,000 persons, who are the whole of the natives of India allowed to be employed in the service of their country at a salary of over 1,000 rupees, only a sum of Rs. 30,000,000 is divided. We therefore have this, that the payment to Europeans, retired and non-effective in this country, amounts to no less than double the entire amount disbursed to every native of India who is allowed to be employed in the service of his own country. I think, Sir, that the fact that such an enormous amount as Rs.60,000,000 a year is spent in England upon retired Europeans is of itself an argument which ought to convince us that there are very great and serious grounds for the amendment which has been brought before the House, namely that the English nation have benefitted pecuniarily as well as politically in an extraordinary degree by means of the system at present obtaining, and which is undoubtedly such a heavy and grievous cost on the revenues of India.

MR. W. S. CAINE: I should like to express my regret if I have unduly interrupted the Secretary of State with interjections, which I think were pertinent, and by which I thought I might be saved the making of a speech. I will only venture to say that if the Government really mean to grant a Committee —and the hon. gentleman's instincts in that direction are sound —it will scarcely be necessary to divide on the amendment. There is no doubt there does exist in the minds of the educated natives of India, as reflected not only by the National Congress, but, by the Press, a strong impression that this country does to some extent milk India by charging to her revenue much which ought by right to fall on our own exchequer. If it could be understood that the reference to the Committee could be so framed as to make it quite clear that the Committee was to investigate the relative proportion in which certain charges ought to be distributed, then this amendment might probably be withdrawn.

MR. FOWLER: That would be the meaning of the inquiry.

MR. CAINE: Then I am quite content. Last Session I called attention to the charge upon India for twelve years of £10,000 as a subsidy for the cable between Mauritius and the continent of Africa; and I was told that the justification for the charge was the strategic position of the Mauritius as regarded the defence of the Indian Empire. That is a charge which ought never to have been imposed on India at all, and it is but a single instance of charges that ought to be borne by this country, but which we cast upon India. As to the British army in India, we should withdraw a considerable portion of it without scruple if we wanted it and it is really in India for British purposes. The men serve in India for four years out of seven; and if India paid for taking them, Great Britain ought to pay for bringing them back again. I hope the Committee will be appointed soon, otherwise there will be disappointment in India as much evidence has been prepared for it.

MR. CURZON: I am sure the House will have listened with respect and admiration to the straightforward and statesman-like speech of the Secretary for India, and particularly to his broad general statement of the services Great Britain has rendered and is rendering to India, and of the spirit which animates us in our relations with India. The right hon. gentleman also made a clear statement as to the nature of the promised inquiry into the financial relations between Great Britain and India; and whether the inquiry is conducted by a Committee or a Commission, I believe it will have the co-operation and support of both sides of the House. I would like, if I may, to add one or two words to the dignified refutation the Secretary of State for India offered of some of the statements which occurred in the three speeches, notably in those of the mover and seconder of this amendment. I cannot help thinking from the speeches of the mover and seconder of the amendment, that they must be singularly oblivious of former debates in this House. Every argument they have used has been heard before, and those who recollect the Budget speech of the Secretary of State last summer will be aware how complete was the answer given to the statements that have now been repeated. Nevertheless, the same platitudes, the same worn-out, threadbare, and preposterous fallacies that were then brought out to be once more shattered, pulverised, and destroyed, have now come up to be again answered six months afterwards. I must say a word upon the concluding part of the amendment to the operation of which the Secretary of State did not find time to allude. The hon. member asked the House to say "that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned." This is a somewhat vague and indefinite proposition, but the hon. member explained that he would adopt the boundaries which existed when the Government of India was taken over by the Crown nearly 40 years ago. The hon. member did not lay stress upon the fact, but the wording of the amendment would bring political as well as military operations within the rule. Does the hon. member really know what were the boundaries in 1857? Has he any idea how the India of to-day differs from the India of 1857? Does he know the preposterous demand he is making upon intelligence and statesmanship? The amendment would apply to our operations in Beloochistan, which are now not military but political, and are concerned with the organisation of an administration. Is that to be met jointly by the Indian and the British Exchequer? The proposed rule would mean that the cost of the Waziri Expedition and the frontier demarcation now being conducted between India and Afghanistan should be borne by the two Exchequers as well as the campaigns on the North West frontier, which are provoked by turbulent frontier tribes and are repelled by local levies. Lastly, it would mean that the expense of the annexation of Upper Burma, authorised of course by this House, but in no sense an operation directly affecting British as distinct from Indian interests, should also have been divided between the two Exchequers. I hope the legitimate responsibility of England for military operations beyond the Indian frontier will never be ignored, and I can conceive of occasions of invasion when a demand might most properly be made upon this country for co-operation. But that the cost of these small frontier wars and expeditions, and the civil organization resulting from their successful issue, should be borne by us in common with India is an idea which will not commend itself to any but the hon. gentleman, and the section for whom he spoke. (Hear, hear). When the hon. member complained that the people of India had no voice in the expenditure of their country, he forgot that by the Legislative Councils Bill of the late Government, from the first time members of were given the right not only to ask questions but also to make statements and speeches upon the Budgets of the Councils. The hon. member must know that the government of India is conducted in as fierce a light as that of this country, and perhaps under a more concentrated blaze. The right to ask questions and to make speeches is a positive guarantee not merely that the views of those for whom the hon. member spoke will be represented, but that nothing in the nature of substantial injustice will be done. It would have been more to the point

if the hon. member, instead of referring to military and political operations, had alluded to a certain Commission of inquiry ordered by this House, and the cost of which is to be thrown upon India. If he came forward with a proposition that we should bear half that expense I am sure he would meet with much support. I pass to the speech made by the seconder of the amendment. I confess Sir, I always listen with astonishment to the speeches of the hon. gentleman (Sir W. Wedderburn). The hon. baronet is a distinguished member of a body of civilians whose rule in India has been eulogised by more than one speaker, and of whom it might be justly said that they are the pride and glory of their country. Yet, coming back here with the traditions of the service upon him, with his great knowledge of Indian affairs, he loses no opportunity of traducing the body of which he was once a member, and slandering the great and splendid work it is carrying on.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: I admit that the service is doing good work, but I contend that it is done on a scale too expensive for the country. I make no charge whatever against the great service to which I have had the honour to belong, but my wish is that the service should be servants of the people, and not their masters. I have no wish to "traduce" the service.

Mr. CURZON: I am glad to hear that repudiation, but the hon. baronet's speech undoubtedly supplied this foundation for his charge—that if the bulk of his accusations were true as to the poverty of the people of India and the oppression of the Government, it would constitute a grave charge against those responsible for the administration of the country. The hon. baronet complained that no reference was made in the Queen's Speech to matters connected with India. For my part, so far from deploring that India is not mentioned, I am glad that the condition of affairs in India is so satisfactory that there is no need to allude to it in the Queen's Speech. (Hear, hear.) The assumption underlying the speech of the hon. baronet was that the military expenditure of the Indian Government was unwise and unjustifiable and their policy rash and unsound. I have myself made in a humble way some attempt to understand the question—(hear, hear)—and I deliberately state that, broadly speaking, the frontier policy of India with the great expenditure it has entailed, has been not merely a wise and statesmanlike, but an absolutely necessary policy. No doubt great mistakes involving enormous financial responsibility have been committed. Nobody would now defend the fatal policy and ruinous cost entailed by the first Afghan War. But we have learnt by experience, and are, I should imagine, extremely unlikely to make any such blunder again. The policy of military expenditure, the frontier expeditions, and the cost of setting up an organised administration after victory has been won, constitute a policy of insurance which we are bound to pay for our great Empire. Our long immunity from war in India has been simply due to the effect of the millions of money we have been content to spend upon that object. The only way, in my judgment, by which we can escape the invasion of India is by rendering invasion sufficiently dangerous to make it not worth while for anyone to attempt it. (Hear, hear.) Seriously as I think this House should scrutinise the various acts of the Indian Government and their consequent financial responsibility, for my own part I am of opinion that the policy of Lord Lansdowne, Lord Roberts, and the great men who for the past 15 years have been making secure the frontiers of India is one that should meet with the gratitude of this country and the support of this House. (Cheers.)

Mr. WEBB: I wish to make a few observations on this occasion. I have lately been in India. I would desire very strongly to deprecate the temper of some of the remarks of the previous speakers, who spoke of the hon. baronet the member for Banff as traducing and slandering the Civil Service of India. I do not think the hon. baronet did anything of the kind; I have carefully watched his speeches on the subject of India, and I never heard anything of the sort. I should think it a great misfortune if any Civil Servants of the Crown are to be above criticism and we are to be accused of slandering and traducing them if we criticise them. I think it will be a great misfortune for the Civil Service and for the Empire at large if we forget that civil servants, no matter how able, are servants of the country. The previous speaker also referred to worn-out platitudes. I think there is a great deal in the past history of this country which should render us very careful about talking of reiterating platitudes, because very often we have had to learn that the reiterated platitudes of one generation are the policy of the next. I wish I could see my way as clearly as some do with reference to these questions connected with India. The question before us is surrounded with a great many difficulties, but we as Members of Parliament are compelled to face them and to do our best to understand them. It is no excuse that the task of governing India is such a difficult one because we must make up our minds when we hear arguments from one side and the other as to which are the best, and act accordingly. The question is, what are our responsibilities and how can we meet them best. One would suppose that the serious state of things in existence would be a reason for endeavouring to make them better and trying to do away with those wrongs which I believe exist under our present administration. If anything, I think what strikes a casual observer in India most is the extreme poverty of the mass of the people and the extent to which they are taxed. When I consider what wages are in England I wonder how wage-earners in India manage to live upon the low wages they obtain. I found that in a large State the wages of compositors were ninepence a week, and that you can have a man to pull a punkah for three annas a day, whilst four annas a day are required for the use of a dog or a horse. I know it is said that the Land Tax is not in any sense a tax upon the people in the sense of the proceeds coming into our Budget. In one sense that is true and in another sense it is not true, because when additional taxation is required in India efforts are made to screw up the Land Tax so as to make up the deficiency, and in that way I believe it comes to be a tax on the people. I believe the Land Tax in many places is being unfairly screwed up. The system there consists of taxing the land not in proportion to what it is producing at the time, but in proportion to what officials think it ought to produce. It is the same as if here a mountain farm in Ireland were taxed at the same rate as wheat land because it ought to be wheat land. The Secretary of State for India referred to the Salt Tax. That has been one of the matters with regard to which the strongest complaints have been made. Salt is so dear that people cannot get enough of it. The amount of salt per individual consumed in India is enormously less than that consumed per head in England. My firm conviction is that both policy and justice require that the people of this country should pay a larger proportion of Indian military expenditure than at present. I believe it would be a good policy, because it would redound largely to our honour and to the satisfaction of the people of India, and at the same time the expense of these frontier wars would be diminished, because we should look into them more carefully. For that reason, if for no other, I do think we ought to be prepared to pay a large portion of this expenditure. I believe it would redound largely to the peace and contentment of India if we did pay a large portion. I would strongly deprecate the feeling of too much satisfaction with regard to our rule of India. It is a great charge and a great responsibility, and I do not think that we ought to be too self-complacent. The Secretary for India says the Government of that country had been good in the past, is good in the present, and would be good in the future. I do not at all say that. Good intentions and honest desire to do right are by no means a criterion that good has been done. I know in my own country that for generation after generation there has been every desire to do right, but because rulers were not acting in accordance with the wishes of the people they made the most dreadful mistakes. I am a supporter of the present Government, but I do regret the temper which the Secretary of State for India has sometimes shown in treating this question. I think when we have only one representative of India that a deeper sympathy should be shown him than that there should be so much readiness to take up his words. Without going further into the question I believe that it is essential for the good government of India that, no matter how well-intentioned our Secretaries are, in some way they should take advantage more than they do at present to find out the wishes and desires of the Indian people themselves. Until that is done we can never be on safe ground and we can never be sure, however good our intentions are, that we are not running any risks. With these few remarks I desire to support the motion.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE: I am very unwilling to make any remarks, but there is just one thing which seems to me ought to be said. From the remarks of some hon. members opposite it might be supposed that our military expenditure is too high —in other words that our fighting strength in India is too high. I do not suppose it will be thought that military expenditure

can be lowered unless the fighting power is lowered also. That cannot be said of all countries as it can be said of India, and I would like this House to consider whether the fighting expenditure of India is more than we want or not; or whether it is as much as we want. I do earnestly advise any hon. member who wishes to understand the fundamental essentials of the military problem, to carefully peruse a work published about two years ago upon "Russia in Central Asia." From that work any hon. member can obtain one of the very best statements I have ever read on the subject. It shows how Russia had advanced to the very gates of Afghanistan, and then it indicates the tremendous torrent, which, upon a declaration of war, Russia could pour like a stream of lava towards India through Afghanistan. The book goes on to consider what reply England could make, and I hope the muster roll it gives and the gathering of the forces which it represents on the side of India would be enough—I hope that in Providence it may be enough. With that, if I had the command, I should hope to check Russia, but it would require all I knew and all my officers knew to do it. And then, look at the awful issues which depend on it, with enough and barely enough to meet them. If we have only enough upon what possible ground can it be argued that the military expenditure can be reduced? I have no doubt the House will consider the statements made by my hon. friend the member for Oxford, who says it is as much as we can do to put 40,000 men—he says 30,000—into line to meet any enemy. I repeat in case of war our force is barely enough, and that any Englishman who considers the relative muster of the forces of the two Empires, I won't say will tremble at the result, but he will pray that the heart of our brave soldiers may be steeled at that moment. These are tremendous issues, and such grave matters ought not to be trifled with, not as they sometimes have been, but as they always are trifled with, both by the mover and seconder of the Amendment. As I say these are tremendous issues; and let me tell the hon. member, who moved the Amendment, with all respect, that it is England who would suffer far more than India if things were to go wrong with British arms in India. I say that all the frontier defences of India are wanted for India itself, and not at all for England. What does the hon. member the mover of the Amendment suppose that England would care for a strip of desert to the East of Merv or a tract of land among the Rocky Slopes of Afghanistan if it were not for India? Of course it is for India and for India alone, and you cannot differentiate between the expenditure on the frontiers and the general expenditure of India because they are all one and the same concern. With regard to Burma what ground have the mover and seconder of the Amendment for asking that the expenses for annexing Upper Burma should be borne by England. Burma is an integral part of the British Empire, and for whose sake was it annexed? Why of course for the sake of India. What do we care for the upper regions of the Burmese rivers except for the same reason. By these transactions we endangered our relations with France, and for whose sake was all this risk undertaken? Of course for the sake of India. It may be remembered that the mover of this Amendment comes from one of the most loyal sections of the British Indian Provinces. I highly respect the noble clan from which the hon. member comes, and I quite admit that it does contain some of the bluest blood among all the nationalities of the earth, but I must say that coming from such a clan, of such a very high reputation, speaking in such high terms as the hon. member did of the benefits of the British rule in India, I am astonished at him bringing forward such an Amendment of this kind. If he will allow me to say so, I do not think the speeches he makes in this House could be made with safety in Bombay. His brother clansmen would be astounded at such utterances.

Mr. NAOROJI: I have said the same things there very often.

Sir R. TEMPLE: This amendment is not seriously regarded by any section of Englishmen, Scotchmen, or Irishmen in this House, except perhaps by the seconder of the amendment and possibly by the last speaker. Does the hon. member for Finsbury suppose if he were to tell the British electorate that India was putting a burden upon our budget, that it would not be very awkward to set up hostile influences against India, and not only that, but between those who were interested in trade with India and those who were not? Really these things are so tolerated by the kind patience of the House that it is time someone should stand up and expose in their true light the sentiments which have been expressed. I am astonished that the hon. member should make such a proposition as is contained in his amendment and could suppose that it could be seriously regarded either by a British House of Commons or by a British electorate. It is no use my going over and over again these questions, which, as has been said, have been pulverised Session after Session. They crop up again just as though they had never been before us. We are again to be told that the people of India are dying of starvation, the very people who are increasing and multiplying more than any nation under heaven. We are again to be told that they are half starved when they are sending 120 millions worth of produce annually to foreign countries, and when they are flooding the British corn markets with grain to the dismay of the English farmer. We are told that their resources are decreasing when their trade is expanding, when their agriculture is spreading fast, and when capital is shown to be growing and accumulating. What my hon. friend who has just sat down urged as an argument was that the wages are very low; but then the prices are very low also. These misrepresentations have been constantly exposed. As one who has served the municipality of London in one of the poorest parts of the metropolis, I ought to know something of the misery and distress which prevails here, and nation for nation and country for country, I declare that there is far less misery in India than there is in this country, and that the actual want and necessity is greater and more perceptible here than in India. I utterly and entirely disagree with all the hon. member's statements about the growing poverty in India. I think the very opposite is the case; and, as for benefits, why, compare the benefits that England derives from India with what India derives from us. We owe, undoubtedly, a great deal of our commerce to India, but what does India owe to us? The people of India owe their lives to us, their homes, their hearths, their freedom, their rights, their liberty and in fact everything. It does astonish me when I consider the way my countrymen have given their lives to the service of India, to see such very scant gratitude shown them by the hon. member for the Central Division of Finsbury. Let me add my testimony to that which I am sure will be borne by every member on this side of the House who has served in India and is acquainted with Indian affairs, to the remarkable skill, ability and patriotic spirit with which the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary for India, has defended the interests of India. I congratulate him on the way he has mastered the Indian problems, and the statesman-like way in which he has dealt with the whole subject.

The SPEAKER: Does the hon. member propose to withdraw his Amendment?

Mr. NAOROJI: May I ask if the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for India adheres to his pronouncement in regard to the Committee of Investigation?

Mr. H. H. FOWLER assented.

Mr. NAOROJI: I very much regret the decision.

The Amendment was then by leave withdrawn.

February 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WASTE LAND GRANTS IN BURMA.

On the motion of Mr. ALPHEUS MORTON there was granted a Return of the number of Waste Land Grants in Burma exceeding 1,000 acres since the 1st day of January, 1870; the names of the original grantees; date of grant; conditions of grant; whether conditions fulfilled; number resumed for non-fulfilment of conditions; dates and particulars of resumption; date and particulars of any assignments of the original grant; names of present proprietors; and copy of all rules at present in force relating to such Waste Land Grants.

COOLIE RECRUITING IN BENGAL.

Mr. SCHWANN asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the remarks concerning the recruiting of coolies in Bengal made by Mr. Toynbee, Commissioner of Bhagalpur Division, and published in the *Calcutta Gazette* of the 3rd October last, in which he gave many instances of criminal complaints, made in the Damka district, with reference to coolie recruiting, and also of cases of abduction of women and children for a similar purpose in in Deoghur, and of the forcible carrying off of youths in Godda district:

And, whether, in view of the constant and apparently un-

avoidable abuses to which the present system of recruiting coolies for the tea plantations of Assam, etc., gives rise, he would consult the Government of India with the view of gradually abrogating these special laws, and leave tea planters in India to obtain coolies like other employers of labour in the open market and under ordinary conditions.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have seen the remarks to which my hon. friend refers, and I find that they have also received the attention of the local authorities. I know that the Government of India are most anxious to gradually abrogate the special law for Assam, and that their recent amendments of the Act were framed with a view to pave the way for a system of absolutely free migration. I will, however, again call their attention to this subject.

FLOGGING IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

Mr. Hanbury asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table any communications that had passed between him and the Government of India, in consequence of his promise given on 16th April last year, on the subject of flogging in the Indian army:

And, what steps, if any, had been taken to abolish flogging in the Indian Army, and thus remove the existing distinction in respect of liability to flogging between the natives of India and all other of Her Majesty's soldiers, including the West India regiments.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I addressed a despatch on this subject to the Government of India in May last, in fulfilment of my promise to which the honourable member alludes. The question has been under consideration since then, and I believe that a despatch from the Government of India will probably arrive by next mail.

February 15th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. Sinclair: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India a question of which I have given him private notice. I wish to know whether it is the case that he has consented to receive a deputation of Scotch manufacturers whose interests are said to be affected injuriously by the recently imposed Indian import duties upon cotton:

And, whether it is the intention of the Government to take the necessary steps for depriving the imposition of the duties of all protective character.

Mr. Fowler: It is the case that I have made an appointment to receive a deputation of Scotch manufacturers with reference to the recently imposed Indian import duties upon cotton.

With reference to the second question, I can only say that in my despatch to the Government of India on December 13th last, I stated that Her Majesty's Government are precluded by their pledges from sanctioning the imposition of import duties upon cotton goods unless under such conditions as will ensure beyond question that the duties thus proposed will have no protective effect. I need hardly say that to that declaration I unreservedly adhere.

Mr. Tomlinson: Will the right hon. gentleman give the same attention to the representations which have been made by the Lancashire cotton spinners and others employed in the cotton trade?

Mr. Fowler: I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman. Is he asking me to receive a deputation from the Lancashire spinners?

Mr. Tomlinson: Yes.

Mr. Fowler: Oh, yes, with the greatest pleasure.

February 19th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Viscount Cross called attention to the delay in presenting the report of the Opium Commission of which he had given notice on the 7th inst. He said, I beg to remind your lordships that so far back as 1893, a Commission was issued to inquire into the whole question of the opium trade, the revenue received in respect of it, and the monopoly of the Indian Government in connection with that commodity. That Commission, as your lordships are aware, was issued after a vote had been passed in the other House of Parliament. The question is one which affects most seriously the whole of India, whether it is viewed from a financial or from a moral or social standpoint; and it is, therefore, a subject in which everybody who is concerned in the welfare of India must feel the deepest possible interest. A long time has now elapsed since the appointment of that Commission. The Commissioners have taken voluminous evidence in India, and last Session everyone was very anxious that the report should be published before its close. In August last the delay in presenting the report was referred to in both Houses of Parliament, and the opinion was then confidently expressed that the report would be issued in November. Since then, my lords, three months have elapsed, but the report has not yet been issued. The Chairman of that Commission (Lord Brassey) has, we have heard, accepted an appointment in one of the colonies (Australia); and I congratulate the colony upon that appointment—(hear, hear)—as well as the noble lord himself. But it is partly on account of the fact that the noble lord will at no distant date be leaving England that I am anxious that the report should be issued so that we may have the benefit of the noble lord's advice and opinions before he undertakes the new duties which no doubt will engross his attention. In the other House of Parliament last Session, it was stated that the Indian revenues were to bear one-half of the charges incident to the inquiry; but this seems to me to be a monstrous burden to throw upon the revenues of India. I had intended to have asked a question to-night on that point, but understanding that it is the wish of the Secretary of State for India that I should not do so now, I will postpone that question for a short time.

Lord Reay: In reply to the noble Viscount, your lordships will probably agree with me, that considering all the circumstances, the extent of the inquiry, the fact that it had to be conducted in India, and that all the members of the Commission were not in this country during the later stages of the work, the time taken by the Commission before issuing the Report is not to be considered excessive. Certainly it is not excessive when compared with the time taken by the Commission on vaccination to which reference was made yesterday in your lordship's House. I am, however, I believe, in a position to assure the noble Viscount that the Report of the Opium Commission will very soon be laid on the Table of the House. The position of affairs is, that the English members have passed the Report with the exception of a summary of conclusions to be put forward at the next meeting by my noble friend the Chairman (Lord Brassey) who, I may say, both in India and in England, has used his influence to expedite the issue of the Report. (Hear, hear.) To-morrow and Thursday next the Commission will meet for the final verbal amendment, and the re-arrangement in some cases of the three or four sections passed last week, and for the consideration of a valuable memorandum on the original draft contributed by Mr. Haridas Veharidas, one of the Indian members, which was received only yesterday morning. The greater part of the Report which has been passed was sent to the Indian members a fortnight ago, and the remainder will go by the next mail. If they agree to the whole they have been requested to telegraph their assent and to send memoranda with the particulars respecting which they wish to qualify the views and conclusions of their colleagues. Mr. Haridas's memorandum has already in a great measure been anticipated during the recent sittings, but no communication has been received from the Máhárája of Dharbhanga. In the event of the receipt of a memorandum from the Máhárája qualifying his acceptance of the Report, the Commission will meet once more to consider his suggestions before ordering the Report to be submitted. I think, however, I may safely say that the Report will be issued before Easter. (Hear, hear).

The Marquis of Lansdowne: I have no doubt that most of your lordships will share the feeling of the noble Viscount (Cross) that it is unfortunate so long a time should have intervened between the taking of the evidence in India and the final expression of the views of the Commissioners, and I hope that the Chairman of the Commission will concur in my opinion that whatever may have been the cause of the delay the Government of India cannot be charged with any responsibility for it. (Hear, hear). I am glad to have this opportunity of bearing witness to the earnestness shown by the officials of the Indian Government throughout the country in facilitating the work of the Commission. The Under Secre-

tary for India (Lord Reay) was perfectly right when he said that in this case there were special circumstances making some delay inevitable. I suppose this is a solitary instance of a Royal Commission having some members domiciled in this country and others living in different parts of India. Those of your lordships who know by experience how difficult is the task of reconciling opposing views on Commissions and Committees can picture to yourselves the embarrassments which must have been occasioned to the members of this Commission when the time came for an interchange of views between the London and the Indian sections. There is another point also which ought to be taken into consideration, namely, that the Commissioners were apparently obliged to compress within the limits of a single cold season an extremely difficult and detailed inquiry. The result was that the evidence had to be taken rather hurriedly. The Commissioners were obliged occasionally to divide into sections, and witnesses had to be summoned from different parts of the country. It gives me, my lords, great satisfaction to learn that the Report may be expected at a very early date. It is, I can assure your lordships awaited with the utmost interest in India, because this is a subject concerning not only the finances of India, but the private lives and the domestic habits of the people of that country. (Hear, hear). With reference to the subject of expense of the Commission which the noble Viscount has postponed, I may say that the general feeling in India among natives and Europeans—officials and unofficials—can I believe be expressed in the following words: "We did not want this inquiry, and if you wanted it you ought to pay for it yourselves." That is the view entertained from one end of the country to the other. (Hear, hear). I will not now press the question further, but I will ask my noble friend (Lord Reay) to consider whether this is not a case in which the costs of the trial might fairly follow the verdict? If the Comissioners should report that the abuse of the opium drug is very much less than has been supposed; should they report that the people of India are not nearly so chargeable with intemperance in the matter of stimulants; should they report that the growth and cultivation of opium in India does not affect the consumption of opium in China much more than the growth of a choice Bordeaux vintage affects intemperance in the United Kingdom; should they report that the Government of India from time to time has done its best to check the immoderate use of the drug and to prevent any artificial stimulus being given to its use; should they report that any further interference with the use of opium might raise, not only financial, but social and political questions of the gravest importance;—(hear, hear)—should they report in this way and to this effect, then I venture to say that Lord Elgin's Government will be amply justified if they say to Her Majesty's Government: "This inquiry was forced upon us under pressure from an influential section in your political community at home, you have failed to prove your case against us; you have unsettled the minds of the people of this country; pray do not, inflict upon us the further injustice of making us pay for an investigation which we regard both as mischievous and superfluous." (Hear, hear).

Lord Brassey: I will not detain your lordships more than a few moments whilst I explain how it was practically impossible for the Commission to present their report in time for consideration in the last Session of Parliament. After having taken evidence in London in September the Commissioners met for the taking of evidence in Calcutta on November 18th, 1893. Between November 18th, 1893, and the departure of the Commission from India on its return to this country, with the exception of some few days at Christmas, the Commission sat every working day often six and seven hours a day, and sometimes two sections sat on the same day. The result of that constant sitting was that the printers could not possibly keep pace with the Commission. I desire to say that at Calcutta the work of the Government printing press was admirably done; but of course when the Commission were at a distance from Calcutta, in the Punjab or in Burma, it was impossible that the Government printers should keep up with the work in a satisfactory manner. It was, therefore, decided to bring the shorthand writers' notes to England, and to print them here. The printing of the evidence taken in India and in Burma was not completed until the end of June. Then it was found necessary to issue interrogatories through the Foreign Office to the Consuls in China and to other persons whose information they were desirous of obtaining with reference to the opium question in China. The replies from China were not printed and in the hands of members till July. It was, therefore, quite impossible for presentation to this and the other House in the last Session of Parliament. They could have presented a short report by meeting in Bombay at the conclusion of their journey through India. They did hold consultations in Bombay, and did decide on resolutions which practically formed the recommendations of the Commission; but it would have been most unsatisfactory to have presented a final report in Bombay without an opportunity of considering the evidence which they had much trouble to take, and which involved considerable expenditure of public money. The report was ready for consideration in the early part of November of last year, and I can truly say that from that time to the present the attention of the Commission has been bestowed with the utmost assiduity upon the subject, which is by no means a simple one. I can only say that the pledge given by Mr. Fowler in the other House of Parliament to the effect that the report will be in the hands of Parliament before Easter will be faithfully kept. (Hear, hear.)

Viscount Cross: I wish to thank the noble lord (Brassey) for the immense trouble he has taken as chairman of the Commission; and I have only to add that I am happy to hear that the report will be presented before Easter, because it is so anxiously looked forward to.

The subject then dropped.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRONTIER EXPENDITURE.

On the motion of Sir William Wedderburn it was decided to present an address for a Return prepared for the right hon. member for South Aberdeen, showing expenditure incurred out of the revenues of India on the construction of railways and roads, and on military expeditions and explorations and subsidies to native chiefs beyond the West and North-West Frontier of India, from April, 1882, to March, 1891.

THE BOMBAY CIVIL FUND.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the fact that, under the existing rules of the Bombay Civil Fund, while the widow of a deceased subscriber received £400 a-year, and each daughter £100, and any daughter who came on the fund after 1865 received a further bonus of £1,000 on marriage, no provision was made to give any extra benefit to daughters who, coming on the fund in middle life, at forty years or over, had practically no expectations of marriage:

Whether a memorial had been submitted to him by a lady, who stated that her father died in 1890, at the age of 85, having paid subscriptions to the fund for 63 years, and his wife having predeceased him, left four daughters on the fund whose ages ranged from 62 to 45, whose prospective chances of obtaining £1,000 by marriage she stated to be nil, and complaining that, although her father had made exceptional sacrifices to the fund, these daughters were excluded from a part of its benefits:

And, whether, as under sections 2 and 4 of The Bombay Civil Fund Act, 1882, discretion was given to the Secretary of State to give additional benefits if he should deem it reasonable he would exercise the discretion by arranging that a lady pensioner coming on the fund after a certain age might, by abandoning her claim to £1,000 on marriage, receive compensation in the shape of interest on that sum to be added to her pension of £100 per annum?

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The facts are as given in the hon. member's first and second questions—but he is mistaken if he supposes (as he apparently does) that the pension of £100 to a married daughter continues after marriage—the donation of £1,000 is contingent on marriage and the pension then ceases. An unmarried daughter has her pension during her life. As regards the third question, it was proposed to the subscribers of the fund, before the passing of the Act of 1882, that the donations to sons on attaining majority and to daughters on marriage should be somewhat diminished, in order that children's pensions, (including, of course, those of unmarried daughters) might be increased; but the members of the fund declined to accept this suggestion, and it is not intended to propose any variation of the settlement which was then made and was distinctly accepted as final.

INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. R. G. WEBSTER asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that in the Administration Report on the Railways of India for 1893-4 there was a schedule of railways lately surveyed, at present under survey, or recently put forward for consideration, in all amounting to a mileage of 6,167:

Whether, during the next three years, he had authorised the construction of 2,000 miles:

And, whether, in view of the serious depression in the iron, coal, and other industries, and the lack of employment in this Country, and the large amount of unemployed capital, the Government proposed to authorise the whole of the above mileage to be immediately constructed.

MR. H. H. FOWLER: My answer to the hon. member's first question is in the affirmative. The total mileage now under construction or sanctioned is about 2,600, of which about a 1,000 miles are included in the schedule to which the hon. member refers. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with the construction of railways in India as rapidly as the resources of the Government of India will permit, and at the same time to make use of private agencies for that purpose whenever suitable terms can be arranged.

Mr. WEBSTER: I should like to ask whether the Government cannot see their way to give an imperial guarantee for the construction of railways in India, as they did some years ago for the same purpose?

Mr. FOWLER: The Government do not see their way to taking that course.

ALLIANCES WITH BURMESE WOMEN.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention had been called to an official Circular recently addressed by the Chief Commissioner of Burma to the members of the Civil Service throughout the province, remonstrating with them with regard to the practice which had become prevalent of contracting illicit alliances with Burmese women, and speaking of it as a public scandal:

And, if he was able to lay a copy of the Circular upon the Table of the House.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have heard nothing of any Circular on the subject to which my hon. friend's question refers; but, since that question was put down, my attention has been called to a newspaper report of a speech by the Chief Commissioner, with the purport of which, as there reported, I entirely agree. From this speech it would appear that he has "semi-officially" and confidentially addressed some of his officers on the subject. If it is true that such a document was issued, and that it was confidential and not official, it is not likely that it will be published either in India or in this country.

SURGEON-MAJOR SMITH.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware that Surgeon-Major F. Clarence Smith had been dismissed by his Excellency the Governor of Madras upon certain written charges brought against him by Mr. Robert Clegg, a member of the Indian Civil Service, stationed at Combaconum; that Surgeon-Major Smith had been refused a copy of the written charges against him on which the Governor had taken action; and that, in a memorial submitted to the Madras Government by Surgeon-Major Smith, he complained that he had been condemned unheard, and without any knowledge of what the charges were upon which he had been dismissed:

If the matter had been referred home to the Secretary of State; and, if so, what had been the result:

And, if he would lay upon the Table of the House copies of all correspondence between Surgeon-Major Smith and the Government of Madras, and between them and the India Office.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: On the 18th January Surgeon-Major Smith sent to the Government of Madras a memorial to the Secretary of State appealing against the decision of the Madras Government in his case. The Government of Madras forwarded that memorial by the mail which arrived yesterday. The matter is therefore *sub judice*, and I do not think that it would be expedient for me to make any statement.

THE CASE OF MR. ARTHUR ROGERS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could now state what answer had been given by the Government of India to the memorial of Sir W. Hudson, President of the Behar Planters' Association, dated 28th January, 1894, on the subject of the slaughter of kine in India:

Whether Mr. Arthur Rogers's scheme, recommended in that memorial, for restoring friendly relations between the Muhammadans and Hindus had been considered by the Government of India and reported on as requested by the Secretary of State in his despatch of 31st May, last;

Whether the Viceroy in Council had approved of Mr. Rogers's scheme, and it had been partially introduced by two Local Governments:

Whether he was aware that Mr. Rogers had been dismissed from his appointment as an engineer on the Bengal and North Western Railway:

And whether he would explain the reasons for Mr. Rogers's dismissal, and would lay upon the Table of the House a memorial from Mr. Rogers in which he sets forth the facts of his case and prays for inquiry and redress.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: A question similar to that of my hon. friend was put in the Legislative Council of the Viceroy on the 25th January last. Sir Antony MacDonnell, the Member of Council in charge of the Home Department, stated in reply that Mr. Rogers's scheme, though not brought before the Government in the regular way, had been brought under their notice unofficially; and that the Government of India had made no use of Mr. Rogers's remedy, and that it appeared to them to contain no proposals of a practical character which the Government of India had not adopted independently of it. I believe that Mr. Rogers was for about four years in the service of the Bengal North-Western Railway Company as an assistant Engineer and that his services have been dispensed with by that Company. In consequence of an allegation by Mr. Rogers that he had been dismissed from the service of the Railway Company through pressure alleged to have been exercised upon them by the Governments of Bengal and the North-West Provinces and Oudh, I am informed by the Government of India that, as far as they are aware, the Board of the Bengal and North Western Railway Company has dispensed with Mr. Rogers's services for its own reasons, and that no pressure was brought upon it either by the Government at Bengal, or that of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, or by the Government of India in the matter. I observe that Sir Antony Macdonell made a statement in the Legislative Council to the same effect.

PARLIAMENT AND ANGLO-INDIAN OFFICIALS.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been directed to the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy of India, in the debate in Council on the Indian Tariff Bill, as published at page 53 of the Indian Tariff Act Blue Book, that members of the Indian Legislative Council were only free to speak and vote in the Council for the measure they honestly thought best, when that was in accordance with the "mandate" they had received from London:

Whether he was aware that the Right Hon. Sir Barnes Peacock and other authorities on Indian constitutional law had denounced that doctrine as an infringement of the rights and privileges of the Council:

And, whether, seeing that the Secretary of State for India, in a despatch dated 15th October, 1874, distinctly stated that the object of the instructions given to the Government of India on this subject was not to fetter the discretion which the law had vested in the various legislative authorities of India, the doctrine now laid down by the Viceroy of India was sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The question of the hon. member raises the important and delicate subject of the relations between the Government of India on the one hand and the Home Government and Parliament on the other. It is impossible within the limits of an answer to deal in a satisfactory manner with this matter; I will therefore merely say that at the proper time I shall be prepared to maintain that the course which has been taken by Her Majesty's Government and by the Viceroy upon recent occasions is in strict accordance both with the Acts of Parliament regulating the Government of India and with the constitutional and uniform practice under those Acts. In order that the leading precedents may be known to the House,

I propose to lay upon the Table the relevant portions of a Despatch of the Duke of Argyll, dated the 24th November, 1870, and three despatches of Lord Salisbury, dated respective-31st March, 1874, 15th October, 1874, and 31st May, 1876, in which the relative position of the Secretary of State and the Government of India were clearly laid down.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Sir HENRY JAMES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received a copy of the memorial of the Bombay Millowners presented to the Council of the Governor-General of India, mentioned at page 24 of the Papers relating to the India Tariff Act; or of the letter of the Secretary to the Mill-owners' Association of Bombay, dated 19th September, 1894, mentioned at page 27; of the memorial and telegrams from the Bombay Millowners' Association, mentioned at page 30:

And, if he was in possession of copies of such documents, whether he had any objection to making them public.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The reference cited in the first and second clauses of my hon. friend's question appear to refer to the same representation from the Bombay Millowners' Association. I also have seen the telegram dated the 19th Dec., cited in the third clause. There is no objection to laying those papers on the Table if they are desired.

SIR JAMES WESTLAND'S DESPATCH.

Mr. MADEN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would place upon the Table copies of the memorials sent with Sir James Westland's despatch of 21st March, 1894.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have no objection to placing on the Table copies of papers received with the Government of India despatch of the 21st March, 1894.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. MADEN asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a telegram from the *Times* correspondent at Calcutta, in which he said that it appeared that all the mills in India except one had ceased manufacturing counts above 20s;

And whether, under these circumstances, he still expected to collect any appreciable amount as excise duties.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have seen the telegram, which apparently refers to the Calcutta mills out-put only. I have no official information on the subject.

February 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India what total expenditure had been incurred in the military, political, and transport operations carried on during the last three years beyond the northern frontiers of India, at Gilgit, Hunza, Chitral, and Chilas, and what portion, if any, had been borne by Kashmir;

And, would any Papers be laid presently upon the Table of the House bearing on the recently reported disturbances in the Hindu Kush?

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I can give the House a return of the expenditure incurred on these frontiers up to the end of 1892-93; but for figures of a later date and for the expenditure incurred by the Kashmir State I should have to ask the Government of India.

If the hon. member alludes to the disturbances in Chitral, the information at my disposal is not sufficiently complete to enable me to lay papers yet before the House.

PUNITIVE POLICE AT BALLADHUN.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India, if the punitive police force was still quartered on the village of Balladhun.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The punitive police force quartered on the villages in the Cachar district, of which Balladhun is one, was sanctioned for one year only which ended on the 30th June, 1894. On the 4th June the Chief Commissioner declined to sanction its retention for a further period. It may therefore be assumed that the force has been withdrawn.

THE INDIA COUNCIL.

Mr. NAOROJI asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Sir Robert H. Davies's term of office as Member of the Council of India expired on the 3rd of March next:

Whether it was proposed to allow the vacancy to lapse in accordance with the terms of the Council of India Reduction Act of 1889, which provided that the Secretary of State might, if and whenever he thought fit, permit the Council to be reduced to ten Members by absorbing vacancies as they occurred.

And whether the Council at present consisted of twelve Members.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: Under the Act to which my hon. friend refers the Council of India has been reduced from fifteen to twelve members. I do not think that it would be to the public advantage to make any further reduction at present.

THE NIZAM OF HAIDARABAD.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether there was any foundation for the statement that His Highness the Nizam of Haidarabad was being pressed to assign to the British Government the surplus revenues of his Berar provinces, or to assign fresh districts for the support of the Imperial defence troops.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The statement, so far as I am aware, is without foundation.

STEEL FOR INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Sir ALFRED HICKMAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that the tests, requirements, and stipulations for steel for the Indian State Railways were such as are imposed by no other railways in the world:

Whether he was aware that such stipulations added materially to the price paid, and compelled the use of foreign ores and materials instead of those produced in this country.

And, whether he would consider the advisability of relaxing these tests, so as to allow of the use on the Indian Railways of British materials.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: My answer to the first two clauses of the hon. member's question is in the negative. As regards the alleged exclusion of British ores and materials, I am advised that the exclusion of basic steel, is confined to the case of axles, tyres, and locomotives generally: that the best class of this basic steel is accepted with certain exceptions, for girders; and that the commoner class is freely accepted when offered for rails and sleepers, which form the bulk of the steel sent to India.

In view of the great importance of securing the best qualities of material, I am advised that it would be undesirable to propose any relaxation of the existing tests.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

A CONSERVATIVE MANŒUVRE DEFEATED.

Sir HENRY JAMES, loudly cheered by the Conservative and the Liberal Unionist members and by several Liberal members representing Lancashire constituencies, said: I desire to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a matter of definite and urgent public importance—the effect of the imposition of duties on cotton goods imported into India.

Sir D. MACFARLANE: I wish, Mr. Speaker, before the question that leave be given is put, to ask for your ruling on a point of order, namely: Whether this motion is one contemplated by the Standing Order which permits motions for the adjournment of the House on matters of urgent public importance. This question might have been discussed on the Address a week ago, and it is no more urgent now than it was then. (Opposition cries of "Closure.") I wish to ask you, Sir, whether you did not give this ruling on the 13th of April, 1894, with reference to a motion of this kind: "I do not think that under the Standing Order of 1882 a motion on a subject

of this kind, having such a very wide scope, was ever contemplated. What I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency—(Opposition cheers and counter cheers)—either in home or foreign affairs, but I do not think it was contemplated, if the House will allow me to state my view, that a question of very wide scope which would demand legislation to deal with it in an effective manner should be the subject of a discussion on a motion for adjournment of the House, because if that was so we might have repeated motions made by the Opposition of the day, not so much in the direction of censuring the Government for action which had been taken or not taken, but for bringing under public notice some grievance demanding instant remedy as in the direction of wishing to introduce legislation on some particular subject." I wish to ask you, Sir, if your ruling on that occasion will not apply to the present motion. (Hear, hear.)

The SPEAKER: I think it is entirely inapplicable to the case, and that the right hon. gentleman is in order in bringing the motion forward, as it relates to a particular subject. (Opposition cheers.) I understand this is an alleged grievance requiring instant remedy.

Sir D. MACFARLANE: Oh! (Cries of "Order.")

The SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. member asked for my ruling, and I expect that he will listen to me patiently. (Opposition cheers.)

Sir D. MACFARLANE: I beg pardon, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The last words which the hon. gentleman has quoted bring the motion definitely within the rule on the point of order, namely, "action which has been taken or not taken for bringing under notice some grievance demanding instant remedy." The reason why I objected to the motion to which the hon. gentleman has referred was that it was of such a very vague character and very wide scope that it could not be held to affect a particular interest. Here, it is alleged, the imposition of these duties affects a particular interest. I have very seldom interfered—I think only once—in motions of adjournment. This is a matter alleged to be of urgent public importance. I cannot deny that it is of public importance, and seeing that the duties have been recently imposed I cannot deny that it is of recent occurrence. On all these grounds I must say that the right hon. gentleman is in order so far as I am concerned. I cannot interfere on the point of order to prevent him from submitting his motion to the House, of which it alone must be the judge. (Cheers.) Is it your pleasure that the motion be allowed?

Most of the Conservative and Dissentient Liberals, as well as several Liberal members, rose in their places, and leave was accordingly given.

Sir H. JAMES: I desire in the first place to remove a false impression which may possibly exist in relation to this motion and its object. Some hon. members may feel that the motion is raised in the interests of a particular trade, and may, from that point of view, be regarded as hostile to the interests of our great dependency in the East. If such a view is entertained I will do all I can to dispel it. There is no one in the House who will not acknowledge that the House ought to be not only just, but even generous with regard to the interests of our Indian fellow-subjects. As our Indian fellow-subjects are not represented in this House it is our duty to see that their interests are not neglected in any course which the Government or this House shall take. And if that be the view of hon. members of this House, still more strongly, I believe, is it the view entertained by those in whose interests I am speaking to-night, namely, the Lancashire trades, and especially the textile trades of Lancashire. The prosperity of India represents the prosperity of Lancashire. (Cheers.) India is the greatest market of Lancashire, and anything which interferes unduly with the prosperity of our Indian Empire strikes more directly against Lancashire interests and trade than against any other portion of the whole country. I can assure the House that those with whom I am associated feel most strongly that they would be acting not only a selfish but an unpatriotic and suicidal part if they desired other than full consideration for the interests of India. Lancashire has no desire to see India, its competitor in the textile industry, interfered with. For years the cotton industry of India has been happily growing to a position of prosperity, until it has become a serious competitor with the textile industries of this country. Lancashire has nothing to fear from that competition. It is perfectly willing to enter into the contest with our Indian fellow-subjects; all it asks is that the race shall be run at level weights. (Cheers.) I hope the House will allow me, in a few sentences, to state the position of the different cotton trades in this country and in India. There are three sources from which the raw material, cotton fibre, is derived. There is, first, the American cotton, which represents the finer description of yarn. There is, secondly, the Indian cotton, which produces a coarse yarn, and which is used in Indian manufactures. A third market, the Egyptian, has come into existence, which, it is supposed, in the competition of finer goods, is about to play an important part. The House will hear this evening phrases describing the measures between the finer and coarser description of goods. I am sure my right hon. friend the Secretary for India will use the terms below twenties and above twenties. That is represented by the number of hanks to the pound. When the cotton is spun off in hanks the coarser is the heavier, and there are fewer hanks to the pound. The coarser cotton is below twenty, and sometimes as low as ten hanks; but the finer quality is lighter in weight, and runs as high as sixty or seventy hanks to the pound. The condition of the market may be described very shortly. In early times Great Britain had no competitor in India, and it was not till 1855, that the first mill was opened in Bombay. From that time to this there has been great progress in the course of the textile trade in India. (Hear, hear.) There has been a growth of mills, spindles and looms, and the result has been that India has taken almost the whole of the Japan and China trade in yarns from Great Britain and also manufactures large quantities of piece goods from the yarn, principally for home consumption in India, but also partly for export purposes. I say again that Lancashire does not grudge that increase for a moment if it is unweighted in the race, and is allowed an open market in India. It is only when that free market is denied to the trade of Great Britain and when a specific advantage is given to a competitor that the trade of Lancashire finds it necessary to make any complaint. This is not a mere matter of wayward complaint. It has always been the contention of Lancashire that the import duty is a dead weight upon its trade. It commenced to make that complaint long ago. I need not weary the House with any historical retrospect, therefore I do not trace the position of these duties. The system of import duties commenced under the old East India Company; they were felt to be a burden, and they were combated by the veteran Free Traders in this House. The matter was brought to the attention of the House in 1877, when the House passed its condemnation upon these duties, principally because they were, in its opinion, protected. The resolution of July, 1877, declared that the import duties upon cotton goods, being protective duties, were contrary to sound policy. An advance was made in the next two years. Between 1877-79 there was an alteration made in the levying of the duties. The line was drawn at 30 hanks to the pound, and no duty was imposed below 30. According to my right hon. friend's view that was no protective duty, because there was no competition in India above the 30's. India produced no cotton so fine as 30, and therefore as the India merchants came to the "30" market there was no protective duty at all it was argued. The House in April 1879 passed this resolution: "That the Indian import duties on cotton goods, being unjust alike to the Indian consumer and the English producer, ought to be abolished, and this House accepts the recent reduction of these duties as a step towards their total abolition, to which Her Majesty's Government was pledged." (Hear, hear.) The House will forgive me if I do not occupy its time by discussing what the effect of a resolution of the House of Commons may be. The merchants and operatives of Lancashire do not say that that resolution is positively to determine their rights; they do not say that that resolution will effect a revolution; but they think that it was an expression of opinion of the House of Commons condemnatory of the duties under circumstances that, I believe the House will see, were much more favourable to their maintenance than those which exist at the present moment. (Hear, hear.) Sir, with that resolution upon the records of the House, the commercial men of Lancashire believed that their position was safe, that no import duties would be imposed on the face of it, and that all the perfumes of Araby would not get rid of its effects. I am sure my right hon. friend shared that view, because in March of last year he said: "I would here remark that when Parliament had, after protracted discussion, arrived at a distinct resolution as to the policy that ought to be pursued in

respect of this duty in India, it would not be open to the Executive Government to take a step reversing that decision, without the matter being discussed in this House." That was the view of my right hon. friend. He knows full well that the policy which was declared by the resolution of 1879 has been reversed, and that without discussion in this House. This is the first time there has been an opportunity of discussing the matter. The duties were imposed during the recess: they were never submitted to Parliament for its consideration, and their policy has never been discussed in this House; and I may appeal to my hon. friend below me (Sir D. Macfarlane), who objected to this motion this evening, whether it is unreasonable to ask for a discussion of the policy of the Government, which has been the reversal of the opinion of this House. (Hear, hear.) If we approach this question with the fullest consideration for the interests of India, will it not be better that the discussion should take place in the interests of the Government, and of the true and right position to be relatively occupied by the traders of this country and those of India? In 1882, in pursuance of the policy declared by Parliament, the duties were entirely abolished, the markets were opened, and under the free market system India progressed: her trade increased, driving Lancashire away from the markets of Japan and China, her spindles and looms increased, her yarns were produced in enormous quantities, coming within fair reach of the amount of yarn spun in this country. The trade of India all this time was flourishing and increasing, and the trade of this country was becoming depressed and each day less profitable; and not only was the position of the capitalist imperilled, but the employment of the operative becoming more precarious. This was the position when there came the necessity, which everyone admitted, of dealing with an Indian deficit. It was not a great deficit, but it was one that it was the duty of the Indian Government to deal with. We had a deficit which I think may be almost traced to the fact that the Indian Government thought it right to consider one particular interest. The deplorable fall in the value of the rupee had caused the officials of the Indian Government, particularly those who had their families in this country, to suffer considerable loss of income. The Government had to make up the deficit, and the course taken by the officials was to look round and see how they could best find the means of persuading the Government that they could receive this addition to their superannuations, pensions, pay, and allowances. They had friends in the country. The Bombay industry has become powerful. The Bombay Millowners' Association was at hand, and the Bombay Millowners' Association held out their hand to the civil servants of India, and appealed to them for help to start this agitation in India to secure an import duty, and from that import duty to find the means of paying this increase to the superannuations, pensions, pay, and allowances to the Anglo-Indian officials. The right hon. gentleman will probably tell you something of Indian opinion. It would be interesting to trace what is meant by that Indian opinion. It is impossible to suppose that a duty which is imposed for revenue purposes only, and which according to my right hon. friend will be borne by the consumers, the natives of India, will be borne by the consumers. Is it possible to suppose that there could have been any enthusiasm whatever on the part of the consumer and on the part of the native of India that he should be taxed by means of this import duty which he has to pay. Of course, nobody wishes to be taxed, and when we are told that the natives of India agitated to be taxed in order to pay the Anglo-Indian officials these superannuations and pensions, I ask hon. members to pause for a moment and ask themselves whether it is correct. The tale is told very frankly at page 48 of the Blue Book on the Indian Tariff Act and the cotton duties. Mr. Mehta, a member of the Legislative Council, said: "But I would appeal to other hon. members who are officials. The present financial exigency is owing not a little to the services having secured exchange compensation. They joined the Indians in agitating for the imposition of duties on cotton imports for the purpose of meeting the deficit largely due to exchange compensation. If after having secured such imposition they would refuse to support the moderate amendment of Mr. Fazulbhai"—another member of the Council—"to succour a native industry from being harassed and burdened, they would be open to the suspicion that their coaxing tones to induce the natives to join in the agitation against Manchester were suspiciously akin to the interested seductions—made familiar by Dickens—of 'Codlin's the friend, not Short.'" Here is the tale thus told of the Anglo-Indian officials joining with the millowners of Bombay to agitate against Manchester. Now, I ask any member of the House is it unreasonable that, when this agitation has been proceeding against Manchester, Manchester should ask at least to be heard in the matter. (Hear, hear.) This agitation has been carried on by the Anglo-Indian officials anxious to receive their pay and to lose nothing: it has been carried on against Manchester, against the trade that has lost by the fall of the rupee more than any other interest of the country. But whilst this agitation has been carried on against Manchester, are we to be told it would be unpatriotic on the part of Manchester to ask permission to state their case to the House? I am very much afraid my right hon. friend the Secretary of State, with the very best intentions in the world, has been misled by these officials. (Hear, hear). He is only an Indian minister; he is surrounded by Indian officials whose duty they may feel is to think only of the interests of India. My right hon. friend had heard all the representations and numerous memorials from the Bombay millowners and the Chamber of Commerce of Bombay. He has listened to every one of the statements that could be brought before him on the part of those who agitated against Manchester. I may say the feeling on the part of the Lancashire representatives is that he always bore in mind he was the Indian minister and never once thought he was a British minister, and a representative of British interests. (Hear, hear). I venture to ask my right hon. friend if he had his attention called to the desire of these agitators to have these duties imposed in August of last year and if he gave his decision upon the subject in December of last year? He had since these many representations read the Report of Mr. Westland, the minister who, when he went to obtain information, went to the millowners of Bombay and obtained the information that was to guide the Legislative Council of India from Bombay representatives and from Bombay millowners. All these my right hon. friend had before him. They represented one view of the matter. Now, I ask my right hon. friend with whom did he take counsel on behalf of Lancashire? (Hear, hear). There has been a practice in these matters. Right hon. gentlemen in the position of my right hon. friend have consulted such bodies as the Manchester Chamber of Commerce: they have consulted men on whose judgment they could well rely, and I now respectfully, if it is not unduly inquisitive, ask my right hon. friend with whom did he consult and learn practically—for there is an immense amount of practical knowledge required—with whom did he consult in order to obtain information as to how far the course he was about to pursue would injure the Lancashire trade? Were these interests considered at all? They could not be considered practically or even theoretically by any Indian minister without an appeal to practical men having practical knowledge of the subject. I must tell my right hon. friend there is a general feeling in Lancashire that he did not consult any one of those practical merchants or manufacturers with a knowledge of the subject, and they have a feeling at the present moment—a feeling which I hope will be removed by the statement of my right hon. friend—that their interests were totally neglected, and that the agitation against Manchester proceeded without those interests ever being heard on their own behalf. If this be the case—I hope it is not—will not my right hon. friend on reflection feel that it would have been well for him if he had taken advice from practical men and learned the effect of his policy upon the markets of this country? I see the Financial Secretary to the Treasury present. I wish he had asked the member for Oldham, in his capacity as the representative of that place, what he, with his great knowledge, thought of the matter. Did he consult the Financial Secretary of the Treasury? Did he consult anyone in a similar position, or did he not, as Lancashire thinks at the present moment, seek guidance alone from those who represent Indian interests and those who had been agitating against Manchester and therefore against the interests of this country? I hope it is not too much to say, on behalf of those who desire most strenuously to see Indian interests always considered, that it is not unreasonable that those interests should be considered with some regard to British interests also. There is no necessity why they should ever be opposed one to the other. Apparently that course has not been taken, hence the feeling which exists in Lancashire—a feeling which is of the strongest kind. I have now simply to point out to the House what it is my right hon. friend has done. He has yielded to the Indian representations; the agita-

tion against Manchester has succeeded. My right hon. friend, I quite admit, deducted somewhat from the demands made upon him, but if Mr. Mehta is correct, the Anglo-Indians asked for a 5 per cent. import duty, and in that respect were comrades of the Bombay millowners. Now all British yarns, British manufactured goods, go into India with an import duty of 5 per cent. upon them. I take that duty as if there were no competition, or as if there were full countervailing duties against it. But an import duty alone is a detriment to trade, it is an obstacle to trade, and there can be no one, I should think, in this House, who would feel that, perhaps, more strongly than my right hon. friend himself, and those supporters of his who are sincere Free Traders must feel that they have been struggling against the imposition of import duties as much as they can. They have a desire to see markets opened, they have preached to the nations of the world the desirability that all markets should be open, and there must be some amongst my right hon. friend's own supporters who will feel with regret that our "position" when we appeal to protective countries is weakened by the act which has taken place. (Hear, hear.) It may be an act of necessity, but when next we preach the doctrine to Germany or to France, or even to our colonies, that protective duties are an evil in themselves and ought not to be imposed, the answer will come to us: "Why look at home; your Imperial Parliament has sanctioned an import duty. Under these circumstances how can you preach to us the folly of Protection and the virtue of Free Trade?" There are some veterans in this House who have not forgotten the Free Trade lesson of thirty years ago, and they will recall the days when we fought for open markets. I think there may possibly be some to-night who will regret that this import duty has been imposed. I am not going to say there is not a possibility of an import duty being justified under certain circumstances, which must be abnormal. Yet I hope I shall have the sanction of the House to the proposition that these import duties ought not to be imposed without their absolute necessity being proved up to the very hilt. The imposition of import duties produces dislocation and unsettlement of trade, and of course the burden must be borne by someone. Perhaps my right hon. friend will say the Indian consumer must bear the burden; but the Indian consumer will not have more money to spend, because you impose this import duty on British goods. He will have the same amount only to spend on cotton goods. Indeed, having this five per cent. duty to pay, or a charge of a farthing a pound more in the weight of the goods, the Indian consumer will have less to spend. There will be, therefore, much less in the volume of the goods bought of the English manufacturer. Producing so much less and receiving so much less for what he does produce, the burden falls on him. It may be said that, *primâ facie*, the Indian consumer does pay the import duty. Of course, his consignee has to pay the import duty, and he must try to get repayment in some way, and he may get it from the Indian consumer. But he may be beaten, as I will show, by his Indian competitor in the manufacture of the goods. At the best, the British producer stands only a chance of receiving the import duty back, and until he knows whether the market will bear an increased price or not, the trade becomes uncertain and unreliable to him. But my friend, in the face of the resolution of the House in 1879, says he will protect the Lancashire manufacturers themselves by putting an excise internal duty upon the production of the Indian merchant; and he thinks that by doing that he will burden him as he has burdened the British importer. But those who have a practical knowledge of the subject say that this countervailing duty is no protection to the British producer, that it fails entirely to counteract the import duty, and, in consequence of the fallacy of my right hon. friend, the British producer will have to trade under a system of protection, protection for the Indian producer against the Lancashire producer. For the imposition of the duty my right hon. friend selected twenties—which I understand means twenty hanks to the pound. So he relieves the Indian producer from all excise duty on everything below twenties. But he says to the Indian producer, "I will put the tax on your produced goods; I will put it on the yarn." The yarn has, of course, to be spun into grey cloth, bleached, coloured and printed, and the different processes represent material and labour. The import duty is placed on the British goods as they are landed, and therefore all the processes I have mentioned are taxed. But in the case of the Indian competitor, the yarn only is taxed, and the result is, that the difference between the tax on the yarn and the tax on the ultimate material is as 60 to 100. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, the Indian producer pays a 3 per cent. tax as compared with the tax of 5 per cent. on the Lancashire producer. That surely cannot be a countervailing duty. No doubt my right hon. friend, inspired by those Anglo-Indian officials who have entered into this comradeship with the Bombay merchants, will say that it would be inconvenient to put the excise tax on piece goods, because it was impossible to get any return of these goods from the Indian manufacturers. But the officials could ask for an estimate and impose a 5 per cent. duty on that estimate, which would correspond with the 5 per cent. duty put on the Lancashire goods. And this is what my friend calls perfect equality; the Indian manufacturer pays 3 per cent. duty as compared with the 5 per cent. paid by the British manufacturer. (Hear, hear.) The Indian manufacturer has got a "pull" over the British manufacturer, and a "pull" of the most important character. I am told that if you manufacture goods at twenties, and if you make them at twenty-two's, no unskilled person can tell the difference. What then is the position of the two competitors in the market? The Indian producer is enabled to produce this "twenties" material at 3d., and the British producer turns out twenty-two's at an equal price. Say it would be a fraction dearer. But he has to pay a farthing import duty on the pound, and it therefore costs him 3¼d. a pound. The Indian producer goes on to the market and says he has goods as good as any of the English goods which the English producer charges 3¼d. a pound for, and he will offer them at 3d., or say 3⅛d., a pound. The English producer is therefore driven out of the market, and has no possible chance of success. It is said that the duties are equal and corresponding, but I have been assured by those who have practical knowledge of the subject that there is a great difference between them, to the advantage of the untaxed and the disadvantage of the taxed competitor. If we fear at the present time, there is far greater fear for the future. (Hear, hear.) There is this in connection with the markets which causes men engaged in the trade to feel the gravest anxiety. Our principal supplies of raw material come from America. British manufacturers pay lower prices than they formerly paid—I believe that prices are lower than ever they were in the history of the trade. (Hear, hear.) Where formerly India had no fine cotton at her disposal, she can now pay for the American cotton at a price which will enable her to compete in these finer qualities. She will, therefore, come into the market competing in these goods with a differential duty of two per cent., and she is laying out her mills for the purpose of using these finer qualities of cotton and competing with the British trade. The Government have made an exemption from the import duties so as to allow all machinery to go in free, and the organisation of Bombay millowners is erecting mills which will be able to produce the finer material from the American cotton with an acknowledged advantage to the extent of the two per cent. duty. Low twenties are now being produced at many mills in India, and the Lancashire manufacturer is being driven out of the market by the five per cent. duty. Lancashire has made her protest as quickly as possible. India has been progressing, and has arrived at a wonderful pitch. From the days when the first cotton mills were erected in 1855, in Bombay, they have continued to spring into existence, until now there are 141 cotton mills in India. In 1882 there were 1,550,000 spindles in India, and now there are 3,500,000. The result is that India is producing 170,000,000lbs. of yarn against the 40,000,000lbs. of British yarn which go into India. Whilst India has been progressing, has the British trade been prospering? According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer you have to look at the volume of trade, and not at the prices. I will not enter into that, but I will ask him is there not a point beyond which a fall in prices becomes a calamity? You may say to the agriculturist that he is producing a necessary of which every man is the consumer, and if the consumer gets his produce cheaply, that is a fact to be gloried in. But does my right hon. friend carry that doctrine to the full extent? This country is a great producing country, and its export trade represents about 200 millions of money. Would my right hon. friend wish to see a fall in prices in all trades such as would reduce that 200 millions to only 120 millions? In some trades there must be a line below which it is not desirable that prices should fall. The agriculturist is a passive sufferer. (Hear, hear.) He must hold his land. He cannot shut it up even if

he does not receive his rent, though in some cases the land has gone out of cultivation. But in the case of a millowner carrying on his mill, and paying from £500 to £1,000 a week in wages, if he does not receive that amount back, the time comes when he must close his mill. My right hon. friend's glorification in falling prices will not be shared by the capitalist who is losing his capital, nor by the nation. If this fall of prices continues, it means the closing of these mills—(hear, hear)—and a sad addition to the already swollen ranks of the army of unemployed. I have spoken with satisfaction of the increased prosperity of the textile trade in India. I wish I could speak of prosperity in the textile trade in Lancashire. Say what you will, that trade was never so depressed as it is to-day. (Hear, hear.) The volume of trade represents nothing to men who are selling their goods at a loss, and there is much astonishment at the speech which the hon. member for Leigh (Mr. C. Wright) made the other day. He then said that Lancashire never was as prosperous as it is to-day, and that he had more money than he knew what to do with. (Laughter.) I understand that he is engaged in a trade of a very peculiar character and of a very high degree of fineness. He has no Indian trade and knows nothing about it. But there are people in Lancashire who have suffered from the effects of this duty. At this moment there are in Blackburn 23,000 looms lying idle on account of the policy of the Government in this matter. What does that represent? It means that some 7,000 people are unemployed. Does the Chancellor of the Exchequer glory over that fact? This closing of mills is progressing, and Lancashire members will tell you that the greatest alarm is felt lest what has occurred in Blackburn should occur elsewhere. It is said that the millowners of Lancashire have not made any returns. But we have returns from public companies. The 93 Oldham companies have a share capital of £3,874,000 and a loan capital of £3,330,000, and while shareholders have been paying interest on the loan capital at the rate of 2½ per cent., the mills have been working at a loss for the past three years. In 1892 that loss was £101,000; in 1893 it was £72,767. In 1894 the loss fell to £15,000, but what might be called profitable work was only done in the early part of the year, and was due to extraordinary circumstances. Since then the loss has been going on increasing. Now, Sir, when is this to end? Is this trade in a condition in which an artificial burden can be gratuitously imposed upon it? With losses growing and with this further burden, do not you think the time is coming when the mills will not be kept open? The trade with China and Japan has shown us an example. The Lancashire trade with those countries is decreasing. In the six years ending 1882, England had two-thirds of the trade in yarns with China and Japan; in the four years ending 1892 we had only one-fifth of that trade and India had four-fifths. In 1893 that trade fell off from the large figures it had previously reached, but the Indian traders would not bear that loss patiently. In alliance with the Anglo-Indian officials they asked for a benefit to recoup them for the fall in the rupee. The trader in Lancashire has taken no such step, but has patiently borne the falling price. All he asks is that reasons should be given why this additional burden should be placed upon him. I hope the House understands how the fall affects the English producer. There has been a fall in prices from two causes. The rupee value of goods fell in India on account of competition. Then came also the fatal fall in the exchange aggravated by the closing of the mints, and the result is that in a few years prices have diminished 70 per cent. on piece goods and 59 per cent. on yarns. This has had to be borne by Lancashire. The fall has, to some extent, been recompensed by the great fall in the price of raw material, but it was not enough to compensate the producer for the double loss. The question is whether he can bear these new duties, and whether or not it is a duty which will have the effect of bringing industrial enterprise to an end. "My right hon. friend may say, "What is the policy that you propose and what would you have done?" That is asking us to bear a grave responsibility. I would, however, have done my best to learn the feelings of those connected with the industry. I do not put forward an alternative policy because I do not know enough of India, but there are those connected with India who say that there are sources of taxation that might afford equally good results with less injustice than by the imposition of these duties. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has gloried in low prices. What does he think of the rich Indian paying less taxes than poorer men in Lancashire? What, then, does my right hon. friend say to a well-regulated income tax? (Laughter.) What a magnificent field there is for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to bring within the scope of his measures the wealthy Indian with his hoards of silver and gold. What a fine scope there is for the application of the graduated death duties to the native Princes with their hoards of precious metals, and what an opportunity there is provided here to relieve the poor consumer in India of the taxation that we have imposed upon him by these import duties. (Hear, hear.) I suggest these points to the consideration of my right hon. friend. (Cheers.) I have had an important duty to face in representing this great interest to the House. It was the wish of the Lancashire owners that their wishes should be placed before the House with the fullest moderation. I hope I have succeeded in doing that; it was the intention in my mind. Only one word in conclusion. I do hope that the words I have spoken on behalf of this great industry have not been spoken in vain. I also hope that the last words of the Secretary of India have not been spoken on the subject. If it should turn out that they have, then I must say that I am afraid the last words of Lancashire have not been spoken. (Hear, hear.) There cannot be an end to this question as it stands at present. There must be many loyal supporters of the Government who know how deep and true is the feeling in Lancashire on this question, and those friends will tell the Secretary for India that the demands they make this evening are not the demands of capital asking for the redemption of inflated profits. This is not an attempt to secure great gains. This is a demand from the humblest men in Lancashire engaged in a trade whose prosperity is threatened, fearful of a time, perhaps not far remote, when the towns of busy Lancashire may be depopulated, when mills will be closed, and looms silent, and when the men will search in vain for means to earn their daily bread. (Cheers.)

The right hon. gentleman concluded by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I agree with my right hon. friend that it is for the public interest that this question should be brought under the consideration of the House. I think the time has arrived when a clear statement of the facts of the case should be made in the presence of what, after all, is the supreme tribunal of this country. Misrepresentation has been circulated not only in England, but also in India, and therefore, on that account, while asking the House to deal with this question as a whole, I will not simply confine myself to that one aspect of the case which my right hon. friend has submitted to the House. Before, however, I enter upon further discussion of this question, I should like to say one word in self-defence, and, what is far more important, a word in defence of those with whom I associate in England and in India, and upon whom my right hon. friend has poured what I may call his eloquent scorn. (Cheers.) My right hon. friend has spoken of the Anglo-Indian officials, some of the most distinguished servants of the Crown both in England and in India. (Cheers.) He has spoken of agitators in India to whose blandishments I have succumbed. I shall tell the House before I finish what has been the part that has been taken in India on this question, but I cannot allow another moment to elapse without repudiating in the strongest terms that there has been any agitation, any conspiracy, on behalf of any class in India in order to deal with this financial difficulty. (Cheers.) You might as well charge the Chancellor of the Exchequer with entering into some combination—I care not on which side of the House the view is taken—with interested classes when he submits his financial proposal. (Cheers.) Perhaps my right hon. friend is not aware that the distinguished man who is at present Finance Minister in India is a man of the highest standing and of the most unblemished reputation, a man who has served the Crown for a long period of years and who has received a signal mark of favour from the Crown for his public services. (Cheers.) My right hon. friend described him as an agitator in combination with a certain class of officials who want to raise their own salaries, and that he has submitted proposals not to me in England, but to the Legislative Council of India, while the Viceroy whom my right hon. friend has chiefly attacked is Lord Lansdowne, who ruled India with such success for a period of five years. (Cheers.) Are we to have men of this character and class, men who by their deeds have shown that they take the deepest interest in the welfare of India, described as entering into a combination with Anglo-Indian officials, agitating against Manchester,

and bringing to bear certain influences on the Secretary of State in order to join in that conspiracy? (Cheers.)

Sir H. JAMES: I never said anything of the sort. I read out the statement of Mr. Mehta to which reference was made. I quoted his own words, but I never referred to Lord Lansdowne.

Mr. H. FOWLER: There was, however, an expression which my right hon. friend used with reference to myself. He did not mean it as a compliment, but I accept it as the greatest compliment. He told the House that I am only an Indian Minister. Yes, that is the post I hold. (Cheers.) It is to India I am responsible as well as to this House—(cheers)—and when my right hon. friend charges me with sacrificing the interests of England to the interests of India he will need very satisfactory proof. He has not given that proof in the course of his speech: but I will show my right hon. friend that the censures upon me in India are quite as severe as the censures upon me in Lancashire. One of the leading organs of public opinion in Lancashire states that "the conspiracy of the Indian service, the Indian cotton trade and Mr. Fowler have succeeded." About the same date there comes from India a statement that "the sacrifice of Indian interests is the principle underlying this measure, and it is a principle to which a Radical Secretary of State has given his *imprimatur*." Further, I observe that it has been stated, not perhaps in a very influential quarter of India—that I should be called "the Secretary of State for Lancashire; not the Secretary of State for India." (Laughter.) That emboldens me to go on with my argument, for having shown the House that I am attacked from two different points of the compass, it is impossible for both to be true. (Laughter.) I cannot have sacrificed Lancashire to India, and at the same time have sacrificed India to Lancashire. (Renewed laughter). I have endeavoured in dealing, not with my own financial proposals but with the financial proposals of the Government of India, to steer an even keel and to do what I thought was fair justice to the interests of Lancashire and to the interests of India. It is not possible to thoroughly understand this question without, in two or three sentences, considering its history. My right hon. friend gave the House a short but interesting account of the various stages through which this question had passed; but I think he ommitted one or two points, to which it is my duty to call attention in order that the House may quite understand that this is not a novel proposal on the part of the Government of India but that duties upon cotton imports have been imposed with a short interval not only during the time of the East India Company, but ever since the Government of India has been handed over to the Crown. Originally these duties were of a protective character, and were, as now, 5 per cent.; they were raised at one time to 10 per cent.; there were various reductions down to the period to which my right hon. friend has alluded, when what I may call the commencement of the agitation in this House against the Indian cotton duties took place which soon assumed a real and substantial form. These duties were attacked entirely on the ground of their protective character. That was the ground taken by one of the ablest of Lancashire cotton spinners, who was subsequently Under-Secretary for India, and whose death we all deplore—Mr. J. K. Cross. He made one of the earliest speeches on this question, and he attacked these duties solely on the ground of there being no excise duties in India, but simply import duties on cotton goods imported. My right hon. friend spoke of the part taken by stalwart Free Traders with reference to these duties, but at that time there were differences of opinion about them amongst the most stalwart Free Traders. No one will question that the late Mr. Fawcett was one of the soundest and wisest of Free Traders who ever spoke on this subject; and he made in this House a speech which I may quote all the more readily because I have not pursued the policy he recommended. I want this House to see how this question then affected the mind of a member who had taken the deepest interest in Indian affairs, and who was himself a most pronounced Free Trader. He said: "Frequent references had been made in this debate to the principles of political economy. If the House were to take the abstract principles of that science and apply them cut and dried without considering the social and political circumstances of the case, they would act more like zealots than politicians—(Col. Howard Vincent: 'Hear, hear,' and laughter)—and might produce an amount of discontent in India which would seriously imperil the integrity of the empire." This is the sentence to which I want to draw special attention: "Statesmen must consider not merely whether a particular tax is theoretically bad, but whether it creates discontent amongst the people, and looking at the question in that light, he asserted that there was no single tax levied in India which was so satisfactory to the people of the country as a revenue raised by import duties." My right hon. friend alluded to the debate of 1877, and to the resolution then passed, but he was significantly silent with reference to an important amendment to that resolution, which was proposed by the noble lord the late first Lord of the Admiralty, who then represented the India Office in the House: the noble lord the member for Middlesex, (Lord George Hamilton). The noble lord would not accept that resolution—namely: "that the duties were protective in their character, contrary to sound commercial policy and ought to be repealed without delay"—without this addition—"so soon as the financial condition of India will permit." (Hear, hear.) That is the crux of the situation, that was the condition on which the House passed the resolution. The House did not then repeal the duties. My right hon. friend would have led anyone to assume that in consequence of that resolution the duties were forthwith repealed. He said that the merchants, manufacturers, and millowners, made their arrangements on the strength of that resolution of the House. That is not the case. The import duties were not repealed till 1882, and they were not repealed because they were duties upon cotton goods, but they were repealed because at that time the financial condition of India allowed of the repeal of all import duties. (Hear, hear.) The argument used in that debate had mainly reference to the coarser counts of which my right hon. friend spoke. This is a point on which stress is to be laid, as it has a bearing on the present condition of affairs; it was pressed in the debate as it had been in Lord Salisbury's despatches of 1874 and 1875. Mr. Sidebottom, who spoke for the cotton trade, said, "We have already lost our trade in the coarser goods, which can be supplied more cheaply by Indian manufacturers." In a subsequent debate, Mr. Briggs states that "the coarser goods were once sent from this country, but that that trade had disappeared because the duties were repealed too late." The argument used in 1875, 1877, and 1879, was just the same argument my right hon. friend has used to-night—namely, that the existence of that duty had prevented Manchester or Lancashire from making the coarse counts, and that if the duties were repealed, the coarser counts would be manufactured, and the trade would revive. I will give statistics which will show how that view has been carried out. Fourteen years have elapsed since those duties were repealed. The trade in the coarser counts has decreased, and decreased, and decreased, until it has reached the vanishing point; and there has been no protection on one side or the other, but there has been a free and open market. My right hon. friend cited lugubrious figures as to the decrease of the cotton trade in India during the last few years. I can only tell him that in 1887-88, the value of British cotton piece goods imported into India was Rx. 23,000,000; in 1892-93 it was Rx. 22,000,000, and in 1893-94, which he has described as a period of unparalled depression, it reached Rx 28,319,805. (Cheers.) We then come to the period with which he has dealt, the period of the Budget of 1894; when the Government of India, and the Government of Great Britain were face to face with what I have described as the financial condition of India. He asks, "Why had you to put these duties on?" And he gave a certain explanation, I know where he got it from; he stated that salaries had been increased and that a deficit had been created in India, which would not have existed under other circumstances. That is not the case. When the Budget of 1894 was under discussion, the value of the rupee stood at 1s. 2d., and the year that has passed has reduced that value to 1s. 1d.—a difference in the financial position which was not contemplated twelve months ago. That fall in exchange will represent at the present time Rx 2,500,000. Take the figures we had before us when we came to consider the financial position. The net difference in the exchange value—that is the net loss on exchange in respect to our sterling remittances as as between the year 1878 and the year 1894—represent no less a sum than Rx 10,253,000, and the loss this year is Rx 12,753,000. Therefore, the Government were face to face with a very difficult and serious financial question; and what was proposed? The Government of India estimated a deficit of Rx 3,000,000, and that deficit they proposed to meet by import duties. I am not aware of any of the agitators spoken of, of any pressure brought to bear in India upon England. I know that Lord

Kimberley was at the head of the India Office, and Lord Lansdowne was Viceroy, and their communications took place by telegram. I have read them over and over again, and I can say that they had reference exclusively to the financial exigencies of the case. The Government of India asked for permission to impose cotton duties, and the Home Government declined. The result of that refusal was that the Famine Appropriation Fund was suspended, that the grants to the provincial governments were suspended and contributions were raised for the provincial rates; and ultimately the financial Minister of India budgeted a deficit of only £300,000. What was said by Lord Kimberley in reply to the protestations of the Government of India against the refusal to sanction the putting of import duties upon cotton? He said this: "If after an interval sufficient to judge of the financial position as affected by the Tariff Act, by the course of exchange, and by other circumstances, there was not an improvement Her Majesty's Government would be prepared to receive further representations from the Government of India on the subject of imposing import duties upon cotton manufactures." After Lord Kimberley left the India Office I had to face this question. My right hon. friend has somewhat imputed to me a breach of faith with the House upon that point, and I am sensitive to any charge of that character. I stated my own view within forty-eight hours of my appointment in reply to the hon. and gallant gentleman opposite. I then said there was no opposition to the imposition of these duties if they were met by corresponding excise duties. But I added that if there was anything of a protective character involved I should not think them proper duties to be imposed without a preliminary discussion in the House of Commons. I wrote a despatch to the Government of India, in which I clearly pointed out that we would not be parties to duties which were protective, but that, if they could suggest a mode by which every element of protection could be removed, we would accept their proposal. On July 27th one of the members for Manchester put to me the question whether in view of the resolution passed on July 1st, 1877, with reference to Indian import duties on cotton goods, I could give an assurance that such duties would not be imposed without an opportunity being given to the House of expressing an opinion on the subject. I replied that the resolution of the House to which the hon. baronet (Sir W. Houldsworth) referred dealt with duties that were protective in their nature. The imposition of duties which would not be protective in their character would not be affected by that resolution. That makes my own position perfectly clear. (Cheers.) In introducing the Indian Budget of 1894 I dealt with the case at great length. And if during that time my right hon. friend had been present he would have heard a distinct declaration on my part, that I was in favour of complying with the request of the Indian Council if the element of protection could be removed.

Sir William Houldsworth: I would call the right hon. gentleman's attention to a subsequent resolution passed in 1879.

Mr. Fowler: Yes; but a good deal happened during the course of last Session. There was a very interesting discussion on this question in the House of Lords, and I think I should be neglecting my duty if I did not call the attention of this House rather minutely to what passed on that occasion. There were present in the House of Lords two ex-Viceroys of India, there was an ex-Secretary of State, and there was also a distinguished soldier who had spent forty years of his life in India, and who had been commander of the forces there for a long time; and those noble lords called attention to a point which my right hon. friend has not alluded to to-night, but which no Government can ignore, and which I am sure this House will not ignore, namely, the political difficulty which has arisen in reference to this question. Let me read what was said by Lord Lansdowne, who had just come back from India, who at least my right hon. friend will admit is an authority on this question, and whom he will not speak of as an Anglo-Indian official agitator. Lord Lansdowne said: "There was never a moment when it was more necessary to counteract the growing impression that our financial policy in India is dictated by selfish considerations. I am not one of those who regard with exaggerated alarm every bazaar rumour which may be telegraphed over to this country from India; but it is idle to conceal from ourselves that many causes are at work which should make us pause before we do anything to shake the confidence of the people of India in the absolute disinterestedness of our rule. Western ideas are spreading with rapidity in the minds of an Eastern population not yet by any means fitted to receive them. The Government must make up its mind to be misrepresented, and may in ordinary cases console itself with the hope that the truth may prevail; but it should think twice before it supplies the party of agitation with a real grievance and the materials for a real indictment to which no reply will be made because no reply is possible. It is a gross libel to say that either of the great political parties in this country will for the sake of a passing advantage deny to the people of India the fair play which they expect from this country." (Cheers.) I will quote also from the speech of Lord Roberts. He approached the subject not as a financier, for he did not profess to be one, but as a man who knew something of the political condition of India; and no Government could disregard warnings coming from an authority like that. He said that "while as a soldier he believed that the prosperity of India depended on the maintenance of our naval and military supremacy, he would say as an Englishman who had lived more than forty years in the country that he knew it depended to even a greater extent on the contentment of the people and their experience of the advantages of British rule. The extraordinary position we occupied in India was mainly due to native reliance on our integrity and honesty of purpose, and determination to do what was right and best for them. If this feeling were once destroyed the consequences would be disastrous." (Cheers.) But a still more important speech, from a political point of view, was delivered in the House of Lords on that occasion by a nobleman whom we knew as a member of this house for many years, and as a Lancashire member, too, and who himself had been Secretary of State for India for six years. What did Lord Cross say—and this is the last public deliverance of an official leader of the Conservative party on this question? He said: "All I desire to add, and I have always said so with regard to the affairs of India, is that this is no party question whatever. It is a question that must be decided by the Government of the day—it is for them to decide whether the course hitherto adopted should be persisted in or not. They have the information to enable them to judge. Do the Government believe that without the re-imposition of these duties Indian finances could not be properly balanced? If they do there is an end to the question. If not, are the duties not to be re-imposed simply because of some kind of fad about Free Trade, which ought not to enter into the discussion of a question as between England and India. If the Government can see no other way of balancing the finances of India they must, at the proper time, consider the question of re-imposing the duties on cotton." Now I have cleared the way as to what I said to the House with regard to what I was prepared to do if the protective element could be destroyed—because we do not share the noble lord's opinion as to its being a fad about Free Trade; we believed it was a reality and a principle to which we were prepared to adhere. We put ourselves in communication with the Government of India. My right hon. friend has not quoted from, or even replied to, the very able minute of Sir James Westland, which I have laid upon the Table; but I will ask the House to consider what it says, and the facts are not open to argument—I have never seen them challenged. Sir James Westland says: "Indian mills do not spin yarns of a higher class than thirties." My right hon. friend has frankly admitted this; though he thinks it may be extended in the future. At any rate, at the present time they do not extend it; and that is proved by these facts. There are 141 mills in India, and 140 of those mills, one in Calcutta alone being excluded, furnish statistics to the Finince Minister. Those mills spun last year 345 million pounds of yarn, of which 215 million was spun at Bombay, which justifies one in regarding that city as the seat of the Indian cotton trade. Close on 20 per cent. were tens and 59·63 were above tens and under twenties. Therefore, you have 79½ per cent. of the whole goods spun in Indian mills under twenties. Above twenties and under thirties were 19 per cent.; therefore you have, very much bearing out what was stated by Sir James Westland, 98½ per cent. of the goods spun in India under thirties and only a very small quantity—1½ per cent—above thirties. And it is upon the latter small quantity that this competition is going to arise. Why do Indian mills spin so largely these coarser counts? Sir James Westland says the reason is that the Indian cotton does not give a sufficient length of fibre for the higher counts. And the accuracy of these statements is testified to by statistics

furnished by the collector of customs at Bombay, who says the export from Bombay of Indian spun yarns above twenty-fours is not one-half per cent. of the whole amount. Therefore, Sir James Westland was justified in maintaining that the industry of India is chiefly concerned with the coarser qualities and that of Lancashire with the finer qualities, and that unless they approach something like over-lapping lines there is nothing like competition between them. What becomes of the imported yarns? They are used for hand-loom weaving, the mills take none of them. I wonder whether my right hon. friend is aware that an enormous number of looms which in India weave yarns for piece goods are in cottage homes. The idea of imposing an excise duty on cottage industries through the length and breadth of India is utterly impracticable. What is the position of these yarns? The House has already been told that the consumption is 340 millions, of which 170 millions was exported, no doubt forming a part of the trade to which my right hon. friend has alluded, but all in the coarser counts. No duty affects them, no competition arises there, and on Lancashire no duty is imposed. There are 129 millions used for this hand-loom weaving of the coarser quality for the benefit of the native population of the poorest character, and only 74 millions is used by the mills. I have means of communicating with quite as competent advisers in Lancashire, perhaps, as my right hon. friend has.

Sir H. JAMES: Name.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: No, I am not going to disclose names, my right hon. friend is surely not the man to make a demand of that kind. Did he think it fair game to suggest that I an ignorant man, knowing nothing of the cotton trade, would dare to deal with this difficult and delicate question in an autocratic spirit without consulting anybody? That is not the way in which I discharge the duties of my post. (Hear, hear.) I have information, it may be sound or it may be unsound, but at all events I have been guided by that information, and the result of the position was that when the Indian Government proposed an import duty of 3½ per cent. on yarns, and 5 per cent. on piece goods, my advisers were of opinion that we must have a uniform duty both on yarns and piece goods. And it is a very singular thing that the Indian argument was exactly the converse of that used by my right hon. friend. His argument is that the duty you impose is only 3 per cent. on the Indian manufacturer, while you impose a duty of 5 per cent. on the Lancashire manufacturer. What the Indian people said was that to put a uniform duty of 5 per cent., was practically charging them 1½ per cent. more than the Lancashire manufacturer. That is the ground they took up; and they gave reasons for it—namely, the position of their mills, the cost of the machinery, having to buy coals in India, and the duty paid upon imported stores and materials. I need not trouble the House with the effect which has been produced in reference to these modified proposals. I don't know whether the right hon. gentleman has read the debates in the India Council ont his question. He has quoted some criticisms of Mr. Mehta, but he did not quote the replies nor the very able arguments which were used by distinguished Anglo-Indians, and by even more distinguished natives, against the imposition of excise duties at all. The excise duty they were willing to accept was drawn at a limit of twenty-fours but I stood to my guns and put the limit at twenties, and that was carried by a majority of only one. And now there are three main objections to the policy of the Government. The first is that we have violated the principles of Free Trade; the second is that we have imposed a heavy burden on Lancashire; and the third that the excise duty is inadequate for the purpose of preventing protection. On the other hand, India says that it is far below the limit at which any effective competition begins, so far as they are concerned, to be oppressive. As to the first objection, my hon. friend in his speech alluded to our preaching to foreign nations, but very dexterously inserted in his argument a change of one of the factors. He said "import duties." But import duties and protective duties are not one and the same thing. (Hear, hear.) They are totally distinct. There is no principle of Free Trade violated by the imposition of an import duty unless protection accompanies it. (Hear, hear.) The abolition of customs duties may be very desirable or not, but we have never recommended foreign countries to abolish customs, but rather protective duties, which are a very different thing. What did Cobden himself say—and I put this to my Lancashire friends who have denounced me as violating the principles of Free Trade? He said, "What is Free Trade? Not a pulling down of customs houses. By Free Trade we mean the abolition of all protective duties." And Mr. Laing, the Finance Minister of India—a Free Trader himself—said that Free Trade does not mean that there shall be no taxes, but that the taxes shall be levied solely for revenue. Every member of this House will admit that this is a Free Trade country. But we raise £20,000,000 of our revenue out of our customs duties. Is it a violation of Free Trade to raise taxes on tea—where there is no corresponding production at home; or on spirits, where there is a production at home, and where in addition to the import duty we levy a corresponding excise duty on the spirits which are thus made. That is the principle that regulates our policy—our Free Trade policy. And bear in mind, the consumer pays. Of course, if, as in America, you allow the native manufacturer to produce the same article, and do not charge him an excise duty, whilst you impose an import duty, he raises his price accordingly, and puts the money in his own pocket. But there is no room for that in connection with the system which we adopt. The next charge is that we have imposed a heavy burden on Lancashire. My right hon. friend drew a picture which I am sorry to contemplate. He must not suppose that the Government have no sympathy for the state of trade in Lancashire, but we do not agree that the depression is aggravated by the burdens put on cotton. I deny the right hon. gentleman's proposition. Who pays the tax? We levy an import duty on a large product of India tea, and last year the tea grown in India paid within a fraction of three millions to the revenue of this country. Is that a tax on the people of India? No it is a tax on the consumer in this country and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer should come to this House and ask the House either to double the duties on tea or take them off altogether the effect of that would be seen in every grocer's shop in Great Britain next morning in the raising or lowering of the price of tea. The tax will be paid by the people as all import duties are—by the consumer. I quite admit that excessive duties so raise prices as to discourage and diminish consumption but I do not think that a duty of a half-penny in 10d., which is the duty now imposed, will affect the consumption of cotton goods of the highest quality and most costly description, and if it does the Indian Government will have the remedy in its own hands, and it will have every inducement to adopt it, because if the duty discourages consumption there will be no revenue. The whole foundation of the argument is that these customs duties shall be paid into the Indian Exchequer. Then as to the third objection that the excise duty is inadequate. We don't levy this duty on the coarser counts because there is no importation of them. It has dwindled down to an infinitesimal figure in the last few years. Some time ago of these coarser counts, under twenty-fours, we sent to Bombay 1,890,000 pounds weight. In 1872, they went down to 234,000 lbs. In 1879, to 166,000 lbs.; in 1884, when the duties were taken off and no shadow of protection existed and the Lancashire spinners had the opportunity of pushing the trade if they had wished it, they went down to 55,804 lbs. Last year they went down to 8,500 lbs. Well, Sir, it is said by the Indian people, as to counts between twenties and twenty-fours, that you are levying a tax because the competition does not begin up to that point. I have made a promise on this point to the Indian people. I have said that if they will prove that the limit of twenty is too low, it shall be raised to twenty-four; and if there is no effective competition between twenty and twenty-four power is reserved to the Indian Government, with the consent of the Secretary of State, to alter that figure. I say to my Lancashire friends that the same principle must apply to them If they can prove that this dividing line of twenty is unjust to them, I am equally pledged to remedy that evil. The principle on which the Government have gone is that there should be no protection. (Hear, hear.) No one will say that it is possible in the imposition of any new tax, especially a complicated tax of excise, to deal at the first moment with all the possibilities of the case, or strike off a measure which will not require amendment. I say frankly and openly to the Lancashire manufacturers, as I have already said to the Scotch manufacturers in dealing with dyed yarns, if you will prove that there is any injustice done to you, I will do my best to remedy that injustice. That is a question for inquiry, and for inquiry alone, and it is impossible to discuss it across the floor of this House, and I for one will not attempt to waste the time of the House by

doing it. Given the injustice, I will endeavour to remove it. (Hear, hear.) Our reasons for imposing this duty are those of financial necessity. We are in these difficulties from two sources of increasing expenditure. It is a matter of history of which this House is well aware that we have added 30,000 soldiers to the army of India—10,000 English and 20,000 native—and money for them must be found. Then nature has added in 10 years 23,000,000 to the population of India, and that means an increased cost of government. But the real and great evil has been the constant fall in the exchange. (Opposition cheers.) The member for Sleaford (Mr. Chaplin) cheers that. I am not going to discuss what is the proper remedy, but I do not dispute the fact, and the fact is that week by week and day by day the cost of India is increasing as the rupee falls in value, and if these duties were abolished at any time in the past it was because financial conditions admitted of it, and if they are imposed now they are imposed because financial reasons require it. Is my right hon. friend prepared to say that import duties are to be placed on every thing else and Manchester cotton goods left out? (Hear, hear.) If you were to take off all import duties it would be a question of millions. On what principle could you justify the exemption of any class? (An hon. member: Put them on machinery.) An hon. member says machinery. Is there any tax on machinery in Lancashire? (Hear, hear.) Can you not buy at the lowest prices and in the cheapest markets? And why should not the people of India do the same thing? And bear in mind that they have to pay the cost of freight and insurance, and have a heavy depreciation owing to the climate. (Hear, hear.) In dealing with this matter we must remember that India is not a self-governing country. What is the position as to cotton duties in other parts of the British Empire? Take Canada, for instance. There the duty on yarn is 25 per cent., except the counts above forties. The duty on woven goods unbleached is 22½ per cent. and on bleached 25 per cent. and on dyed and coloured goods 30 per cent. At the Cape of Good Hope there is a uniform duty of 12 per cent., and in New Zealand a duty of 20 per cent., excepting on sewing cottons or yarns, and 10 per cent. with certain exceptions on woven goods. The people of India know all this. You cannot explain to them with the accuracy you can explain here all the distinctions of the fiscal arrangements between self-governing colonies and countries like India. But I need not dwell on this. Beyond all question the imposition of these duties is popular in India, and if the Imperial Government had taken the course which my right hon. friend thinks they ought to have taken, it would have had a very grave political effect. He talks about agitators, but I will tell him that every authority for the expression of public opinion in India believes we have acted rightly on this occasion, and widespread dissatisfaction would be felt in India if we disregarded their feelings in the matter. You ought not to defy public opinion in this matter. You may try to educate and improve it, but we have to deal with the facts as they are. I have only to say, further, that as in 1894 my noble friend, Lord Kimberley, in the exercise of constitutional power refused to sanction these duties, I, equally in the exercise of constitutional power, have sanctioned them. (Cheers.) I am prepared at the proper time and place to argue that there has been nothing oppressive, unprecedented or illegal in what has been done. This is the way in which the financial policy has been regulated, and in a day or two I will lay on the Table of the House, the most masterly despatches of two distinguished men who have held my office—the Duke of Argyll and the Marquis of Salisbury—who have dealt with this point of the relationship between the Home Government and that of India on the general and financial policy, and when I have done so, I am sure the House will be satisfied that whether the course now taken be right or wrong, it is strictly in accordance with precedent. Our case in one word is this: the state of the finances of India necessitated additional taxation; the opinion of the Indian Government and people was unanimous in favour of customs duties on imports; the Home Government could not permanently compel the people of India to exempt their largest imports from these duties; we were compelled both in the interests of India and of our own manufacturing population to require that these import duties should not be protective whenever goods were imported from abroad and were in competition with similar goods manufactured in India. We say in explanation of this that there is not, and has not been for many years, any effective competition between India and foreign countries in respect of the coarser cotton goods which, we allege, are consumed in India by the very poorest class of the population; that to tax these goods would be a grievous and an oppressive direct tax on the poorest part of the natives for which there is no justification. (Hear, hear.) We say that goods of a finer quality are not produced to any extent in India, but that Lancashire has a monopoly of them, and, I believe, will continue to have it. (Hear, hear.) We further say that if it should appear on clear evidence that the Government have drawn the line too high, or that its operation does not remove any and every protective character, Her Majesty's Government will, in concert with that of India, consider the matter with a view of loyally carrying out their intention to avoid protective injustice. (Cheers.) That is the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and that is the policy which I have endeavoured, feebly and imperfectly perhaps, to pursue during the time I have been in office. I believe I have tried to do my duty to India as Indian Secretary, and that I have not neglected the interests of the people of Lancashire. I and my colleagues are, of course, responsible to this House, which is the ultimate tribunal of all these questions. We know the consequences that will follow if this House should censure the administrative acts of the Government. (Hear, hear.) We shall not shrink from accepting that responsibility if that censure is inflicted. But I would also say respectfully and firmly that if the Government is responsible to this House, this House is responsible to the country. My right hon. friend has said that India has no representative in this House. I deny the accuracy of that allegation. The representatives of India in this House are not one or two individuals, not even the section of members who are thought to be experts on the one hand, or those members who have a profound, a deep, and a special interest in Indian affairs on the other. Every member of this House whether elected by an English, or by a Scotch, or by an Irish constituency, is a member for India. All the interests of India—personal, political, commercial, financial, and social—are committed to the individual and collective responsibility of the House of Commons. I ask the House to discharge that gigantic trust uninfluenced by any selfish or party feeling, but with wisdom, and justice, and generosity. (Loud general cheers.)

Sir G. CHESNEY: I should wish to be allowed, as one who is particularly interested in India, very earnestly to bear my testimony to the powerful arguments of the Secretary of State, and to urge that this House will not take any steps in the interests of any party in England which would be calculated to have the injurious effect upon the people of India which the sort of decision adumbrated by the motion of the right hon. gentleman (Sir H. James) would have the effect of inflicting. Sir, the right hon. gentleman (the Secretary of State) has truly pointed out the injustice and the illogical nature of dealing out to the people of India high-handed measures which would not be inflicted on any self governing colony. It is sometimes said on behalf of any such action that whereas the people of the Colonies have their representative institutions and are really independent, India does not govern itself and has not free institutions, and that therefore Parliament has a more immediate right to interfere directly in Indian affairs. Sir, we know very well, and the people of this country understand very well, that they cannot venture—whatever their powers legally may be—to interfere in matters of tariff and revenue with the affairs of the Colonies, and if it be urged that they can do so in the case of India, this at least, Sir, may be pleaded, that if India is not self governing, India is entirely self supporting. India bears all the weight of its own defence, of its own administration. The loans raised by India are raised upon her own responsibility, and are not guaranteed by the Government of this country or by this Parliament. Therefore I think hon. members ought to see that it would be extremely unjust for Parliament, while having no responsibility of the expenditure of India, to dictate to the Government of India in what way the taxes of that country are to be levied and what their fiscal arrangements should be. And, Sir, I would also ask the attention of the House to this point, which has not been touched upon by the Secretary of State. It is this, that the sort of direct action and interference which has been suggested by the right hon. gentleman (Sir H. James) to-night is practically an entirely new departure. In former years Parliament did not interfere directly with Indian finance. I would remind the House that about 35 years ago when the finances of India were placed in a state of embarrassment owing the great expenses of the Mutiny

and the loss of revenue that followed it, the revenues of India being then in a state of great embarrasment, the Government of India put a very heavy duty on almost every article imported into India. I think the duty was at one time as high as 20 per cent. Mr. Wilson, who held the position of secretary to the Treasury, was sent to India as Finance Minister, and he reduced these duties to 10 per cent., not because he questioned the right or propriety of the Indian Government to impose them, but because he found they were so excessive as to be destroying the import trade. But not a word of remonstrance with the Government of India was ever raised in this country. It was felt that in a great emergency, it was the duty of the Government of India to take whatever measures were necessary to restore the financial equilibrium. Those duties were gradually reduced to 7½ per cent., and afterwards to 5 per cent. In 1882 they were taken off altogether, not in deference to any definite instruction, or any specific declaration from this country, but because the improved condition of the finances of India permitted of their remission without the raising of any countervailing taxation. Now, an entirely different state of things has arisen, and nothing that has occurred in the past, prevents the Indian Government from raising these duties to meet a financial emergency. I would ask the House also, to bear in mind that the present difficulty has arisen almost entirely owing to the fall in silver, andnot only has the action of the Government of this country prevented any re-adjustment or rehabilitation of silver, but they have also prevented the question from being even discussed in a rational and sympathetic way. The Home Government and Parliament are, therefore, under a great responsibility to the Government of India in this matter. The Secretary of State, Sir, has referred to the different degrees of reciprocity in practice in England and in India. A great cry is now raised by an English industry because a 5 per cent. duty is to be levied on a certain class of goods which had been specially exempted from the general tariff, applicable to all other imports. But we in England tax the commoner kinds of Indian tea to the extent of 100 per cent., and cigars, which could be purchased in India at 1s. per 1,000, pay a duty of something like 1,000 per cent. In the face of these facts can this country, with any sort of conscience or reason, complain if, in the interest of a shattered revenue, a duty of 5 per cent. is put upon a certain class of goods imported into India. We have been told, Sir, of the enormous importance of this 5 per cent. duty to Lancashire trade, but no branch of trade with India can flourish unless the people of that country are contented and prosperous. As the Secretary of State for India has said, there are latent forces in India ready at any moment to make themselves felt on the surface of society, and it is necessary that the Indian people should feel not only that they are governed justly, but that they are governed in their own interests. If we do not, then sooner or later, if a feeling of mistrust in the honesty of the English Government and its representatives in India should be suffered to arise, then assuredly we shall have gone a long way to break down the union which prevails between the two countries. I am sure I am not exaggerating the gravity of the case. Lastly, I would ask hon. gentlemen to consider that the hon. member for Bury has made out no case for any alternative action. He proposes a motion of rejection or of suspension, but what does he say is the alternative of these cotton duties? He disclaims all knowledge of any practicable measure to be substituted for them. I deeply regretted to hear the unworthy insinuation made by the right hon. gentleman against those whom he termed the Anglo-Indian officials. He gave the House to understand that these duties had been proposed by them in order to augment their own sustentation allowances and pensions. Sir, the high officials who have been instrumental in proposing these measures have no sort of advantage in the exchange compensation allowances, as they are called, which have been established solely in the interests of the poorer servants of the State, whose incomes, very moderate before, and not more than sufficient for decent maintenance, have been cut down one-half by the depreciation in the value of the rupee. It is, of course, open to anyone to call in question the ability, or the judgment, of the Indian public servants, but this is the first occasion on which their motives have been impugned, and it is greatly to be regretted that so improper an insinuation should have been made. I shall certainly oppose the right hon. gentleman's motion. (Hear, hear.)

MR. BARLOW: Having had a good many years' experience of the importation of goods into India, I naturally do not approach the subject with any predilection in favour of an import duty on cotton goods going into India. It is stated in a Blue Book that during the past twenty-five years the importation of British cotton into India has increased largely, and that the output of cotton in India has also increased largely. These are facts which no one acquainted with the matter will question. The increase in the importation of piece goods into India was much more rapid during the last ten years than it was during the ten years after the duty was abolished. The Indian industry extended more rapidly when it was protected than before. The Blue Book also shows that, not only has the Lancashire cotton trade increased in India, but it also shows that when there was no duty the manufacture of cotton goods had increased very considerably in India. Whilst the Chief Secretary for India alluded to the fact that India had some advantage in competing with Lancashire, he also asserted that she had many disadvantages. She had to pay heavily for machinery; but there is no doubt that the manufacture of textile fabrics in India is largely on the increase, and that is not confined to cotton goods, but also extends to manufactured jute goods. Now the Government has done right, I think, to recognise the fact that India has managed, in spite of the position of Lancashire, to get to itself the production of yarns under twenties against Lancashire, and I think the Government has been well advised in exempting from their taxation those coarser yarns, because I consider that the production of yarn has been wrested from Lancashire, not only for India, but for China and Japan. I have often been in Lancashire, but I cannot say that I have noticed the complacency with which—the right hon. gentleman the member for Bury, seems to assert—the Lancashire people regard that increased Indian production. Lancashire, I believe, is naturally and seriously alarmed at the increased production of the Indian mills; but they are, judging by the history of the past, able to hold their own, and fight their own cause. (Hear, hear.) There is an idea that the interests of Lancashire have been sacrificed to the interests of India, and that the cotton duty is a duty which has been imposed upon cotton goods solely. The duty was imposed upon other goods which had been imported into India some time before it was imposed upon Lancashire goods, many months before, and a special exemption was made in the case of cotton goods for the benefit of Lancashire. I do not believe that that exemption, if it is thoroughly understood throughout the country, will be at all popular. The principle which I believe ought to be applied to this question, is that there ought to be equality as between the cotton industry and other important industries in connection with the goods which are imported into India. I must admit that if the statutes were relaxed, which were imposed upon simple cotton goods manufactured in Lancashire, and without any counteracting excise duties, and not applied to other goods, I for one would oppose the tax most strenuously, as being unfair and unjust to Lancashire; but when other goods are taxed, I see no reason why Lancashire cotton goods should not be taxed too. I can also bear witness to the fact, that much as this matter is disliked in Lancashire, the action of the Government is, I believe, quite as much disliked with regard to other duties in India on lighter goods, protests against which I receive by every Indian mail that comes in, not from officials and natives, but from men in an independent position, who say that the English Government is sacrificing India for the benefit of Lancashire, and for the sake of the votes which Lancashire brings. The position must be one of great difficulty and delicacy to deal with, but my own impression is, looking into the matter carefully, that the Government in dealing with this matter, and bearing in mind that money was to be raised, are acting in a manner, which, taking all things into account, is the most equitable to all the different interests involved. I think they have dealt with it in a manner, which, by taxing both Indian producers and English producers, has been accepted by both sections of the community, and will cause both ultimately to desire that the tax may be removed as soon as is consistent with sound financial policy. I shall be glad when the finances of India are in such a satisfactory condition that it is possible to remove, not one tax, but both together. (Hear, hear.) But I think that we here have to regard this matter not primarily with regard to the interests of Lancashire; we must approach it from a national and Imperial standpoint. This House is committed, not only to the interests of Lancashire, important as these interests are, but also to those of our vast empire, including India with its 250 millions of people. If some few gentlemen who represent Lancashire are combin-

ing with gentlemen opposite to turn out the Government, will they, if they succeed, support this question? Does the Opposition intend to abolish these duties? Does the Opposition mean to make India, with its vast interests and population, a mere ball to be kicked about the floor of this House? As regards this financial policy, I am willing to recognise that they have great responsibilities with regard to her financial position; but I am not unwilling to thwart a policy which, if adopted, would permit India to exist merely for our own profit, and to be governed without reference to her own interests. It would be unworthy of the name which we bear as Englishmen and the traditions we have inherited from the men who formed our Empire. It is a policy which would meet with disaster, and one which the Government would never adopt and the country would never sanction. (Cheers.)

Mr. R. W. HANBURY: No one can echo more thoroughly than I do the feelings and sentiments of the right hon. gentleman expressed in the eloquent speech which he addressed to this House. Everything he has said points to the necessity of the most complete justice being done to India, and has my most cordial sympathy. Throughout the whole of this discussion, one fact has been emphasised, and that is that India is represented by every member in this House. I contend that it falls upon every member of this House, whether he represents Lancashire or not, not to lose sight of the interests of India. (Hear, hear.) It certainly does seem to me that of all the counties in England, Lancashire is the best able to take that view, because when we consider the enormous trade that Lancashire has with India, we see that Lancashire is more vitally interested in the peace and contentment and prosperity of India than any other county, and therefore I do not think it ought to be said for one moment that Lancashire has selfish interests in this question. I think this is a wider question than a mere Lancashire question. It raises some very important questions for the whole of England, because it is a very serious thing when our agriculture and trade are in their present condition—when agriculture is almost dying out in the country that the next greatest industry should be in any way crippled. (Hear, hear.) The cotton industry is almost confined to this particular county. If it was diffused throughout the country, and any serious harm came to it, those employed in it might find employment in other industries, but if Lancashire suffers there is no outlet outside that county for similar employment, and it would be a serious thing to have a whole county practically ruined. (Hear, hear.) I think that in this discussion the case of Lancashire has been put too low, while too much has been said about Lancashire's selfishness. (Hear, hear.) On the other hand there are the claims of India in this question. What is the contention we have heard on the other side of the House? The contention is that India has a perfect right with regard to her finances to consider her own interests alone. I give that an emphatic denial. I do not believe she has the right. I think that in these matters in a great Empire like this, the interest of the mother country is fairly entitled to consideration. (Hear, hear.) To take any other view than that is surely to take a view that is opposed to one of the strong tendencies of the day. That tendency is to come to some arrangement whereby trade between the mother country and the colonies should be increased. (Hear, hear.) Even if India was a self-governing colony there would be pretty much the same objections raised as there are now, because her finances are practically in the hands of this House. England is not responsible to anything like the same extent for the credit and finances of the self-governing colonies as she undoubtedly is for India. In the first place India would never be able to borrow on such easy terms as she does had she not England at her back. No doubt it is a startling thing to say that England after all is to a very great extent responsible for Indtan finance, but we have, by the way, in which this House has constantly interfered with Indian affairs, made this House of Commons to a very great extent responsibe. And if India had a deficit which could not be fairly met by taxation, this House would have to come to her rescue. There is this broad distinction between India and the self-governing colonies. I say that India is not entitled to levy import and protective duties that we at home could not levy. (Hear, hear.) We only ask to give exactly the same terms to India in this respect, that we are perfectly willing to enforce upon ourselves. So much from a general point of view. There is one consideration that has not been presented to the House, and that is this. I ask myself ss a Lancashire member, how is it that this deficit comes about? My view of the case is this, that if this Imperial Parliament and the British Treasury did its duty to India there would be no deficit at all. As a Lancashire member I consider it thoroughly unjust that because England as a whole and the British Treasury do not take their fair share of the military charges, and as a consequence India has a deficit in her finances, the whole burden of that deficit should fall upon Lancashire. (Hear, hear.) Let me point out how in my opinion this arises. I have seen in some Lancashire papers suggestions that there ought to be a subsidy from the Imperial Parliament, to avoid the necessity of these import duties. I do not think that is a fair contention, and I cannot take that view for a moment. But I think that pretty much the same result is arrived at by looking at the subject in another way. In the first place I do object most strongly—if my argument is correct that Lancashire is made very largely responsible for filling up the deficit in the Indian Budget—I do object to Lancashire being made indirectly responsible for a good many of the fads that are thrust upon India. But that undoubtedly is the result. This House of Commons if it forces upon India peculiar ideas that are entirely out of consonance with Indian opinion, and which are certainly out of consonance with the oppinons of the majority of the Lancashire Members as well, does a most unjust thing. But this it undoubtedly does. Take for instance the Opium Commission. Why should India pay half of the cost of that commission? I say that if we adopt the principle that Lancashire is to be made responsible for Indian deficits we must keep a greater check upon the House of Commons' fads. (Hear, hear, from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.) I don't know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer will agree with me in the next fad I am going to produce. There is no doubt whatever that the Cantonments Act is entirely against public opinion in India. We Lancashire Members are charged with fighting in the face of Indian opinion. Is not the Minister responsible for the Cantonments Act fighting in the face of Indian opinion? Does he not know that hardly a single voice is raised in the Indian Council in favour of that Act? What is going to be the cost to India to enforce the Cantonments Act? Sir George White tells us that if this Act is given full effect it will be doubtful indeed if our Indian Army will be able to carry on its work and that the large amount of money that is being spent on that army will be inadequate and that we shall have to add largely to the Indian forces. I say again is it right to satisfy a fad of that kind, is it right that the whole burden should fall upon Lancashire alone. I take another point, I think that reductions ought to take place in expenses of the Indian Office itself. The expenses of that office are out of all proportion to the work which it does. The India Office is quite out of the control of this House. The Commission which inquired into every other Department of the State was not allowed to look into the India Office. I should not have thought that the cost of that office would be anything like the cost of the Foreign Office, which has the conduct of the whole foreign affairs of this country nor as much as the cost of the Colonial Office, which deals with the whole of the Colonies. But what are the facts? While the Colonial Office costs only £40,000 and the Foreign Office £60,000, the India Office costs £120,000. I say, therefore, that at any rate £60,000 might be saved. I will take another point—a point which I have often raised in this House, and which I shall feel bound to raise again every time the War Office estimates come on—I mean the charges on the Indian army. The charges are grossly unjust, and if India were self-governing would never be imposed. What are these charges? India bears the whole of the charges for all the troops in India; she pays the whole of the passage of our troops out to India; she pays the whole of the passage of troops back again here to England, and for everything on board ship, medical expenses, and all the rest of it. Surely it would be thought that in paying all these expenses Indin had borne her full share of the cost? But there is actually an addition to these enormous charges. In the estimates of this year there is a sum of nearly £600,000 which India is called upon to pay for the training of troops in England itself. I say that is perfectly monstrous. (Hear, hear.) And if Indian troops are employed anywhere outside India, as they were in 1882 and 1885, it is India and not England which bears the cost. Then, again, when Indian troops came over to the opening of the Imperial

Institute it was India that paid. I say that when India is made responsible for her own troops inside and outside it does seem monstrous that in addition she should have to pay this large sum of £600,000 for drilling troops in England itself. (Hear, hear.) These are only a few charges. India's deficit is placed at a million and a-half, and here we have items, which come to nearly £800,000, which ought to be borne by the Imperial Parliament and not by India. I pass to one other point. While I agree with a great deal that was said by the Secretary for India, still in some respects I think the right hon. gentleman went on a false presumption altogether. Is he sure that these duties will not be protective? If he is not sure, then his case is gone. (Hear, hear.) I should like to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he thinks the principles of Free Trade are being fairly carried out, because I have here a remarkable statement made by him at the dinner of the Oldham Chamber of Commerce the other day in which he said that "in his opinion Mr. Balfour's speech the previous night was an extremely fair exposition of the question. He deeply regretted that it should have been necessary to impose import duties of any kind that were not in harmony with free trade." (Cheers.) They are protective duties and not in accordance with free trade. I shall be pleased to hear from my right hon. friend what he has to say upon this question. There can be no doubt whatever that these excise duties are so illogical that it will be impossible for them to last. These import duties remain, but the excise duties cannot last. Let me speak of some of the inconsistencies with regard to these countervailing duties. In the first place they are partial, being only countervailing duties in regard to cotton. The Secretary for India took great credit to himself for making no exemption with regard to Lancashire as to the import duties, but why has he made this exception with regard to Lancashire by these excise duties? There is no reason whatever why these excise duties if they are to be maintained should make exceptions in favour of Lancashire. Every other trade should pay countervailing duties. Then again I believe that the cost of collecting these excise duties will be almost as much as the amount they produce. Take another point. I have not heard anything as to any arrangement with the Indian native States. Has such an arrangement been made, and are these excise duties to be made in these States as well? If the mills in India have to pay excise duties they will be transferred to places where they will not have to pay such a duty. (Hear, hear.) I am not quite sure of my figures, but I think that the territory of the native States is something like 600,000 square miles, while the territory of England in British India is 800,000. Therefore the native States are nearly three-quarters as large as British India, and with regard to this enormous territory you have made actually no provision at all with regard to these excise duties. Things cannot remain in their present illogical condition. If you are going to have countervailing duties at all they should be extended so as to embrace say the worsted goods of Bradford. But if you are going to extend these excise duties generally you will be doing the greatest injustice to India, because you will be doing your best to crush industries upon which the prosperity of India so much depends. I pass to another point. I have argued already that these duties will at any rate soon become protective. The Secretary of State for India admits already that they are protective. I take another point. The right hon. gentleman said that these duties would fall, not upon the producer in Lancashire but on the consumer in India. India is one country and England is another. England is a very rich country and the average income is 20, or 30, or 40, or 50, or 60 times as large as the average income of India. India—that is our point—is a remarkably poor country; and so poor that the consumer cannot afford to pay the extra price. And for that reason we in Lancashire feel that it will fall upon the producer in Lancashire. In the case of an extremely poor country like India I think there can be but very little doubt whatever that these duties will fall on the producer, partly because in India the consumer is so exceptionally poor, and partly because he can afford to wait; whereas the producer in Lancashire has got his mill and his machinery running and he is obliged to sell for whatever price he can get. I know that we may be told that all these goods which India buys are to a great extent sold to the rich of India and not to the poor. I do not know how that can be the case when I consider the enormous amount of Lancashire goods that are sent to India, amounting to about £28,000,000 a year; I cannot be persuaded that they are mostly sold to the rich of India; I am told that there are very few rich in India and I think it will be found that the Lancashire goods are being sold not to the poorer but to the richer consumer in India. Then with regard to these excise duties; I am afraid that they will have another unfortunate effect on the English producer which I should like to point out very particularly, and it is this. In the first place what would be the result if the excise duty is put only on goods over twenties. Naturally, the result will be that more commoner and coarser goods will be consumed of twenties and under in India and they will thereby escape the excise duty. When the people find that the excise duty only touches the goods above twenties and does not touch those below, naturally there will be a much greater demand for twenties and under, and you lose your excise duty on goods above twenties. Then what about the Lancashire trade. Does it not also lose its trade? The result of these excise duties in India undoubtedly will be almost as disastrous to English trade as the import duties themselves, because the result will be that you will have a much greater demand for the non-excise paying goods under twenties. The result will be, I say, that the English trade, which is largely in goods above twenties, will to a large extent cease in this respect, and more than that, you will have been creating this large amount, this increased demand for goods under twenties in India, and the whole of that will be protected against England. I don't know why Lancashire has not her interests fairly guarded. It might be asked why she might not set to work and weave more goods of that class for export to India. The answer was that it would not be profitable to do so as long as no countervailing excise duty was imposed on the Indian-made article. The complaint of Lancashire is not so much against the Indian Government, which, after all, had a deficit to make good, as against the Government at home. India and Lancashire are united in maintaining that a number of the present Indian home charges ought to be borne by the Imperial treasury. These charges ought not to fall either on Lancashire alone, or upon India alone. I think it is monstrous that Lancashire should be expected to pay for the costly experiments of faddists, through whose action expenses have been incurred, which have helped to increase substantially the Indian deficit.

Capt. J. SINCLAIR: It is gratifying that there is no necessity to discuss on this occasion the general question of our Indian policy, the various points of criticism which the Indian government may be open to in other respects. Nor does it seem necessary to give much discussion even to this question of import duties; for it seems that we must at this present time accept and bear them however much we may dislike them in principle and however much we may hope that in the future, whether by increased prosperity, by the lessening of the public burdens in India, by the distribution of public burdens, or by economics in administrations, they may be done away with. This consideration considerably lessens the area of the subject we have to discuss; and lessens it to great advantage. I think one consideration must have occured to anyone who listened to the speech of the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary for India; and that is, that it is necessary to take a wide view even of this comparatively small subject of import duties. One observation we may recollect with advantage, is that the import duty was decided upon on the initiative of the Legislative Council. That brings us to a further consideration in which I think we must all acquiesce that, as the Legislative Council is the organ of British Authority in India, it would be a very serious thing to deal any blow at that authority, and it would not be an attempt in which we as Liberals could find anything congenial to our principles in other respects. I do not follow the hon. member for Preston in the remarks he made upon two points—as to manufactures in the native States, about which he will find full particulars in the Blue Book, and on the question of countervailing excise upon articles. My chief object in asking the permission of the House to make a few observations on this occasion is that I wish to mention an interest which has hitherto scarcely been mentioned in the discussion, but which is vitally concerned in this matter—the interests of the dyers of Scotland, who are large exporters to India and British Burma, of goods which will be greatly affected by this import duty, and by the New Tariff Act. The policy is this—that the import duty is to be levied upon these materials on all counts, whereas under the Tariff Act the excise duty is to be levied upon such counts as

are above twenties. Now Scotch manufacturers, and especially those who work in my own county, acquiesce in the import duty. They recognise—and on their behalf I am glad to bear testimony to the fact—that it is necessary to take a wide and broad and liberal view of the necessities of the situation; but while they acquiesce in the imposition of an import duty, they want to draw the attention of the House and of my right hon. friend to the effect of the Excise duty upon their exports to India. It is maintained by the Secretary of State that of these lower counts which are not subject to the Excise duty, or against the exportation of which there is no countervailing Excise duty, the total imports into India had fallen to 8,500 lbs. weight last year in Bombay. I wish to remind the House, however, that there are very considerable exports of dyed yarns of these low counts to British Burma. The average exports to that country of these counts, indeed, has for the last four years been something approximating to four million pounds weight per annum; and at least half of this amount will, I understand, come under the import duty and will not be protected or will not be countervailed, if I may use the expression, by equivalent Excise duties upon Indian manufactures. In this part of the trade, therefore, there is direct competition on the part of our Scotch manufacturers with the trade in India. Twenty-ones made up as twenties, and dyed in India will be landed duty-free in Burma; whereas similar yarns dyed in this country will be subject to import duty there. There was the further point, that Indian yarns above twenties, which were subject to excise duty, were subject to this duty in their grey state, whereas British yarns were made liable to import duty in their dyed state. To sum up, the situation as it affected Scottish manufacturers was this: that the Indian dyer paid no duty on twenty-one's and under, and less than one-half the duty paid by the British dyer on yarns over twenty-one. Perhaps I may take this opportunity of thanking my right hon. friend, on behalf of those interested for whom I specially speak, for his courtesy in consenting to receive a deputation on this subject next week, and to discuss these points with them, and also for his courtesy with regard to the communications which have been sent to him by the Scotch manufacturers, through me. He has been good enough to repeat fully and explicitly the assurance already given that he intends on behalf of the Government to deprive these duties of all Protective character. That assurance, I am certain, has given great satisfaction to all who are so deeply interested in the trade as are those on whose behalf I speak; and I am sure that they will do everything that lies in their power to give my right hon. friend all the information which will enable him to form a full and correct estimate of the circumstances of the case. I assure him that all they ask for is no unfair advantage or preferential treatment—simply justice as between themselves and the Indian manufacturers.

MR. T. SIDEBOTTOM: The system of Protection inaugurated by these duties ought, in my opinion, to be condemned alike by this House and by public opinion throughout the country, for it is difficult to determine whether it is not more injurious to the interests of this country than to India itself. I say system of Protection advisedly, because the right hon. gentleman in his able speech gave the whole case away when he said that the bulk of the yarns sent to India was consumed by hand looms. It is obviously impossible to collect the excise duties from hand looms, therefore what becomes of the argument as to its being a countervailing duty? (Hear, hear.) The amount of this duty is five per cent., and it undoubtedly increases the price of cotton goods throughout India and greatly handicaps English manufacturers, hampers our trade with India and fosters and encourages the rise of cotton mills in India to an undue and unfair extent. Some members may think five per cent. is not such a heavy duty and cannot make so much difference, but I must remind them that the charge against the English manufacturer is not that his profit is excessive. Many of them would be glad if they could ensure even a five per cent. profit. It may be said we don't hold India for the benefit of the Lancashire manufacturers, and that we should approach this question from an Indian point of view, but it seems to me that on that ground even these duties are thoroughly indefensible. We are told—the right hon. gentleman himself has told us—that the people of India are in favour of these duties; but who are the people of India? They do not consist exclusively of the Government officials we have heard of, and the shareholders of cotton mills. If it were possible to consult the great body of consumers in India, I venture to think they are far too acute and too much alive to their own interests to be in favour of anything of the kind. They are bound to see that this is a tax upon what constitutes their chief article of clothing. In one of Lord Salisbury's able despatches on this subject he said that this duty is maintained at the expense of the consumers, principally the poorer classes, against whom it tells with particular hardship. Those are wise words, and as true as wise. It is undoubtedly the duty of the British Government to do everything in their power to develop the material resources of India, but it surely cannot be their duty to tax the many for the benefit of the few, or to assist English and other capitalists in amassing enormous fortunes by developing cotton spinning and cotton manufacture in India to the ruin of manufacturers here. Although the poorer classes are very heavily taxed the rich landholders and the higher classes generally possess, many of them, fabulous wealth. An income tax or some other means of meeting the necessities of the Government might have been found without taking such a retrograde step as the re-imposition of these most obnoxious protective duties. Apart from their bearing on the direct interests of India, I think the effect of these duties on the great cotton trade of this country should be taken into account. We are at present in a dreadful state. The cotton trade is, in fact, in a state of partial collapse. Never before in its whole history was greater depression known, and it is greatly to be feared that the distress and want of employment, already sufficiently serious, will be greatly aggravated unless measures are speedily taken. Many mills are working at the present moment wholly for the sake of the operatives, and many concerns are unable to sell more than a quarter of their production. Under such circumstances these duties are of the most oppressive and onerous character. They amount to nearly half the wages that we pay to our weavers for weaving our cloth, and constitute a tax of more than half-a-crown a loom. (An hon. member: "Question.") I believe my statement is perfectly accurate. So far as our competition with the Indian manufacturers is concerned, we do not object to the natural advantages possessed by our Indian rivals: we do not object to their advantages in cheap labour and in the possession of markets near at hand; but we do object to have our trade taken from us by our own Government by the aid of protective duties. It is the inherent right of all the subjects of the Queen to trade freely in the British dominions. (An hon. member: "Canada.") It is well known that these duties have been imposed owing to the exigencies of the Indian Government, and it is also well known that India at the present moment is suffering from a great fall in exchange owing to the depreciation of the silver, but if that depreciation has been a source of loss to the Government of India, the loss to British manufacturers has been as great or greater, and it has for long constituted a very heavy and oppressive tax on our industry. It seems hard, therefore, that in consequence of this fall we must pay another tax in addition. We object entirely to the impost. We hear a great deal about the largeness of our exports to India, but the arguments founded upon the fact of our large exports are very fallacious, and the deductions and conclusions drawn are entirely erroneous. These heavy shipments which took place recently were, to a great extent, caused by the anticipation of these duties. In very desperation manufacturers sent goods to India, hoping that something might happen to enable the difficulty to be solved. I am told that the markets are now glutted, and I should not be discharging my duty if I did not impress on the Government that the condition of the trade is all the more serious in consequence. I hope the Government will give the subject careful consideration. We have more and more competition to encounter every year. I have faith in the energy of our race and the future of our country. (Hear, hear.) I believe we shall have a revival of our trade sooner or later, but, in order that we may hasten it, let us discard these miseralbe remnants of Protection, this policy of a bygone age. (Hear, hear.)

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE: Speaking for one of the largest centres of the cotton industry (Burnley), I can say for my constituents that they are not animated in this matter by any unworthy jealousy or by any disregard for the interests of India as a whole. The people of Burnley have this peculiarity—that while one large section is engaged in weaving cloth, which happily goes all over the world, another large section is

engaged in the manufacture of looms which are sent to those very Indian manufacturers who are the cause of the imposition of the import duty about which all this agitation has arisen. (Laughter.) I can say, therefore, that my constituents do not regard the matter from purely selfish standpoints. Indeed, I can go further, and say that the people of Lancashire as a whole are animated in their action by no selfish considerations. We have heard a great deal, in the course of recent debates in the House, of the selfish and sectional interests of the people of Lancashire. That same cry was raised fifty years ago when Lancashire led the way in the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws, and as the people of Lancashire were then the foremost champions of Free Trade, they are to-day the foremost supporters of Free Trade. (Hear, hear.) The Secretary of State has made a powerful speech. If I venture now to enter upon a criticism of it, it is not by way of depreciating its merits, but of endeavouring to point out that he has missed some of the grounds on which this motion was made, and he does not meet the objections raised by the friends of this industry in Lancashire. The right hon. gentleman commenced with a cordial advocacy of the merits of the Anglo-Indian officials. I am not aware that the member for Bury made any attack on those officials, or that he said anything derogatory to Mr. Westland or any of those distinguished men who serve the State with such energy in India, and whose merits we all recognise. It cannot be denied that while a very competent, it is a highly-paid, and that in a sense it is a protected service; it could not be denied that when it had complaints to make it had an amount of representation in the Government of India which certainly the natives of India had not in a proportionate degree. We know that this service has sums to remit to England and that its members complain of the depreciation in the value of the rupee. But when we find that one of the principal features of the Indian Budget is to make up the loss in the value of the rupee for superannuation and Home Charges to the Anglo-Indian service in India, when we know that that amount which is to be added to the Indian Budget is to be made up by a charge like the import duties on cotton goods, I think, Sir, we have a right to protect the great industry in question and protest against our being made the victims of that necessity, and to say that while we recognise the merits of the Anglo-Indian service it is not entirely from us that the money shall be made up. The Secretary of State entered at great length into what he was pleased to call "the financial necessities of India." But not once, either directly or indirectly, did the right hon. gentlemen dispute the demands of the Indian Government for additional revenue, which everyone knows is solely needed in order to make up the loss entailed by the officials of that Government owing to the depreciation in the rupee, and not once did the right hon. gentleman suggest the possibility of meeting the deficit by a reduction in expenditure, but throughout his entire speech insisted absolutely in the production by some sort of taxation of this additional revenue required by the Indian Government. I believe, and in that belief I am surported by a large section of Indian opinion, that there are great possibilities of economy in both the military and civil charges of India. (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, we are told that public opinion in India is entirely in favour of those duties. I should like to know how the right hon. gentleman arrived at his knowledge of the public opinion in India. There are two branches of public opinion in India. There is the public opinion which is purely official, which, it would seem, has alone guided the right hon. gentleman in the judgment at which he has arrived. But there is another public opinion which is solely interested in the welfare of the people of India, and which insists that if due economy were exercised in the public charges of India, justice will be done to the natives of India, and at the same time Indian finance will be settled on a satisfactory basis, and without recourse to duties upon articles of primary necessity to the poorer classes in India. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman quoted the opinion of Lord Lansdowne. But he forgot to give the House the opinion of one of his most eminent colleagues in the Government, Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, who, when approached only last year by a deputation of the Blackburn Chamber of Commerce, said: "There is only one considerable source of revenue, and I mention it with a thrill of horror—import duties." (Laughter). "I need hardly say that that is not within our contemplation. I do not suppose that anybody would attribute to me a heresy of that kind, and I only mention it for the purpose of dismissing it." (Laughter.) I do not know whether the noble lord has been converted by the Secretary of State for India to views which only last year he looked upon as heresy; but, at all events, the people of Lancashire have reason to complain that the Government of which the noble lord was a distinguished member should, without any sufficient justification for their change of position, sanction the imposition of import duties, which, in the opinion of the noble lord, was a serious departure from ancient Liberal traditions. (Hear, hear.) I am glad to hear that the right hon. gentleman is prepared to reconsider the arrangement with regard to the countervailing duties; but though I accept it as a good augury for the future, I do not think it will justify the Government in the new departure they have made. Every import duty in India, of whatever nature, must be a tax on the consumers of India; and it should be remembered that cotton cloth is one of the primary necessities of the natives of India. The right hon. gentleman seemed to assume that it is only a small question of the number of counts, and that if he changed the particular count to 16 or 25, as the case might be, it would meet the difficulties of the situation. But it would do nothing of the sort. What the right hon. gentleman has done is to authorise an excise duty upon yarn alone, and it is because it is on yarn alone that the opponents of the policy said that no matter what the right hon. gentleman might do in regard to the change of count, the duty would still act as a protective duty. I have shown that Lancashire has some right to have her case heard. Twenty years ago the whole country was agitated to obtain a repeal of these duties; in 1879 a resolution was passed by the House of Commons, condemning the duties as unjust to the Indian consumer; and it is not to be supposed that, by small concessions of detail, Lancashire will now be brought to consent to the reimposition of the duties. I accept with great satisfaction such concessions as the right hon. gentleman has made, but if the right hon. member for Bury goes to a division, I shall vote with him to record my protest against these duties. (Hear, hear.)

Sir J. LEIGH: Lancashire is suffering very much from depression at the present time, and we do think that a more inopportune occasion could not have been chosen for disturbing our trade than the present one. I quite agree with the last speaker that Lancashire will never rest as long as these import duties remain. But I must say that the speech of the Secretary of State for India—particularly that portion of it in which he undertook to consider any suggestion for correcting the protective character of the duties—commends itself very much to my judgment. I think, Sir, that the members for Lancashire ought now to turn their attention to bringing before the Secretary of State for India all the suggestions they can for removing Protection from these duties. I think the mover of this motion proved conclusively that under the present proposals the Indian weaver will be protected to a considerable extent, and also that if, owing to the cheapness of American cottons, the Lancashire spinners found themselves able to compete in coarser counts India, with these duties, would prevent that competition. I think, Sir, we shall be doing our duty to our constituents if we turn our attention to bringing all the pressure we can to bear upon the Secretary of State for India to remove every element of Protection from these duties. I regret very much that the state of trade in Lancashire is as bad as it it, and we must leave no stone unturned in any direction; and particularly must we see that in such a market as India we have a fair field. I shall not trespass further upon the time of the House than to say how gratified I am for what we consider is a change. If it is not a change, it is more than I expected from the Secretary of State for India. Had it not been for that concession I should have felt it my duty to vote in favour of the motion. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BECKETT: I do not think that anybody can doubt that the member for Bury was right to raise this discussion in the House. Least of all can the Government complain, because the motion has afforded them an opportunity of explaining their policy in a manner which must carry conviction to every unprejudiced and patriotic mind. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman proposes to divide the House on this occasion, but I am sure I should think it a mistake if he does so, for I cannot see the justification for attempting to turn out the Government on this occasion. None of those who spoke in favour of the motion seemed to face the difficulty, which is that there is a deficit which must be met, and which must be met immediately.

That difficulty must be met by an increased revenue, and no gentleman has another way of increasing the revenue except by those duties. That being so, it seems to me that those who advocate this motion have no good cause to offer unless they can substitute any exchange for that which they condemn. The right hon. gentleman said the voice of Lancashire had never been heard on this question at all. But it would be a strange thing if the voice of Lancashire had not been heard, for Lancashire had never been backward in making its voice heard upon any particular occasion. I think that the voice of Lancashire has been heard, and heard very effectively. Many members of this House have endeavoured to vindicate Lancashire from selfishness. If Lancashire is not actuated by selfish motives, by what motives is it actuated? Naturally Lancashire looked after her own interest. But the Government are bound to consider the interests of India quite as much as the interests of Lancashire—(hear, hear)—and in this matter it seems to me Lancashire has undoubtedly been treated with very great consideration, that every attention has been paid to her wishes. These duties upon cotton have not been imposed until they were an actual necessity, it is the very last source of revenue to be touched. The cotton trade has long been enjoying special exemption, and I cannot see on what ground Lancashire can claim to be exempted further. (Hear, hear.) The interests of Lancashire have been safeguarded in other ways by the imposition of new countervailing excise duties which the Secretary of State for India has explained, and that duty is levied at a higher rate than is usual in such a case; also, it seems to me, that if you are entitled to make a demand for the free entry of manufactures into India, India is entitled to free imports into England. (Hear, hear.) How can the opponents of cotton duties in India defend the imposition of tea duties in England. (Hear, hear.) They contend that we are taxing Lancashire and England for the sake of India, and India might as reasonably contend that she was being taxed for the benefit of England. That import duties are an evil cannot be denied, but are they a necessary evil? The right hon. gentleman the member for Bury made a serio-comic suggestion that a graduated duty should be imposed, and the member for Stalybridge said the rich men in India were taxed at a lower rate than the rich men elsewhere. Then the hon. member for Bury said that this duty came to be imposed in consequence of the continuous fall in the value of silver, and hon. members, he said, ought to know the consequences of our vicious financial position; but it is not enough to say that it is caused by a fall of silver unless you are prepared to adopt some measures to protect silver from falling still further. (Hear, hear.) You are in a difficulty because you cannot get other countries to go with you, or to adopt your favourite remedy of bimetallism. Unquestionably this question has been started by bimetallists, and that is why I, and others who think with me, view it with suspicion. If it is caused by the fall in the exchange it must work both ways. It acted as a bounty to manufacturers of cotton in India, and it is difficult to say whether England or India has lost or gained most by the fall in the value of silver. It is asked why we should deny the Indians the right exercised by our self-governing colonies. The very fact that India is not represented in this House ought to make every member careful to look after her interests and give weight and and authority to the opinions expressed by Indians. The member for Preston said an outcry would be raised if a colony was to impose a duty of that kind. When Mr. Rhodes proposed a 12½ per cent. duty all over Africa he received the enthusiastic support of Lancashire. (Hear, hear.) It seems to me that the attitude of the Opposition to attempt to turn out the Government on this question is a somewhat unfortunate one. (Opposition cries of "No.") Then I suppose you are not going to vote on this subject. If you do vote it will be a vote to turn out the Government, and if we have to choose between the solvency of India on the one hand and a slight and temporary reduction of profits in Lancashire I should not hesitate which course I should take. In supporting this matter we are taking a sound view of our Imperial interests and duties, and I say it will be an ill-omened day if the Unionist party were to defeat the Government on an issue on which the welfare of India depends so largely. (Cheers.)

Mr. WHITELEY: I wish to deal with the question as a Lancashire manufacturer, and to ask you to judge by the effect that these import duties have on one branch what the general effect will be? I wishto impress upon this House the importance of this matter to Lancashire, it is a matter far-reaching and the gravity of which cannot be exaggerated. Those who put on those duties have struck Lancashire a very cruel blow. We vainly imagined that with a Liberal Government in power the doctrine of Free Trade would have been upheld—the doctrine so much belauded by the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other night. (Hear, hear.) In that expectation we have been fortified and justified in declarations of ministers during the past twelve months. It is very difficult to reconcile the policy and acts of the Government with the last resolution on the subject that is recorded in the books of the House of Commons. That resolution is a broad and comprehensive one, and it is to this effect: "That the duties on cotton goods are unjust alike to the consumer and producer, and ought to be repealed." The Secretary of State for India says these duties are not protective, and that the principles of Free Trade have not been violated. He seems to have a curious political arithmetic of his own: One duty equals Protection, but two duties, in his estimation and in that of the Liberal Government, are Free Trade. (Laughter.) We are often taunted in Lancashire with the question as to how it was we never discovered the enormity and wickedness of the import duties until our own manufacturers were touched. (Hear, hear.) There are various answers to that question. Lancashire is not the custodian or the guardian of the whole interests of the trading communities of this country, and furthermore we venture to argue that there is no comparison and that no analogy can be drawn on the question of the import duties on cotton goods and other products entering India, for this reason, that in the cotton industry there is great competition between India and England which does not exist in other branches of trade, and further that the export of cotton goods from this country is so large and bulks so overwhelmingly in the total exports from the British Isles that it exceeds the balance of all others. Take the Board of Trade returns for 1894. I find that the total amount of British exports in 1893 was £28,776,000, of which cotton yarns and goods amount to £17,864,000, or 62 per cent. In none of the other branches of trade is there any competition between this country and India, but with this trade there is very great and growing competition between this country and India. The hon. member for Bury pointed out that at the present time in India there were over three millions of spindles, whereas ten years ago there were only 1,600,000. The increase in spindles has been over 100 per cent., and of looms 73 per cent., whilst the increase in Great Britain during that time has been only 5 per cent.; on the continent 19 per cent.; and in the United States 20 per cent. This proves to demonstration that the cotton trade in India is a thriving and a progressive industry, whilst at the present time in Lancashire, taking the whole of the limited liability companies in the south of the county, the position of them is a retrogressive and a declining one. I may say also that we attribute the action to meet this deficit in India last year to the effect of the representations of the Bombay millowners. This great question between Lancashire and India has been sprung upon us because pressure has been brought to bear upon the authorities in India to impose these duties, and cause a wall of protection to be built around the Indian industry which it is impossible for Lancashire to get over. (Hear, hear.) If I cannot prove my contention to the satisfaction of the right hon. gentleman, I will almost go so far as to say that I will resign my seat in the House. (Laughter, and a voice, "No, don't do that.") I admit that it would be a misfortune if I did. (Renewed laughter.) I venture to say that up to the twenties protection to the Indian industry is absolute. In the able report of Sir J. Westland which is in our hands, and which was quoted bythe right hon. gentleman, these significant words occur, "It will obviously never pay Manchester to use America cotton at 4d. per lb. in making a class of goods which every Indian producer can make as well with cotton that costs 3d. per lb." On that text we base the whole of our contention. If this is true, then the converse is true. (Hear, hear.) At the present time, with American cotton at 3d. per lb., it would pay the Indian millowners to import American cotton rather than use Surat, or other Indian cotton. At the present price it would also be open for any Lancashire manufacturer to compete upon equal terms. But we cannot do it. I have mills and I cannot do it. And for this reason, that around this Indian business the right hon. gentleman has placed a wall of protection. I venture to say that so long as the 5 per cent. duty is placed upon twenties and under, so long is it absolutely out of the power of the Lancashire manufacturers of cotton goods to

compete with India. That is an absolute fact. Neither the right hon. gentleman, nor the whole of the Ministry, nor the whole bench of Bishops were they in this House—(Laughter)—could deny it. Next, I say that over 20s. instead of the protection being absolute it is partial. That I can prove likewise. The House will understand this, the yarn value of cloth is only 60 per cent of the total value. Now, in India, the cotton manufacturer is taxed upon the yarn value, while goods sent from here to India are taxed upon the full value, so that there is a difference in favour of Indian manufacturers of 2 per cent. I have proved under 20s. that the protection is absolute and that over 20s. it is partial, now I will deal with the question as a whole. I have here an extract from a leading newspaper the *Calcutta Statesman*, which in combating the opinion of a Mr. Tata that serious injury was being done to the Indian cotton trade, says: "To a large extent the diminished consumption of goods in the dutiable class, that is of goods over twenties will be counterbalanced by an increase of goods under twenties. In other words it will mean merely a transfer of the demand from one class of goods to another, a change to which the majority of mills will probably be able easily to adapt themselves." That shows that the effect of these duties will be to switch off the demand for English goods and create a demand for Indian goods. I venture to say that the Secretary for India would have found out a great many of the difficulties of the case if he had only consulted Lancashire manufacturers. (Hear, hear.) But he has not done so. Indeed, I believe that the only representative he has consulted upon the matter belongs to the other side, namely, Sir James Westland. Sir James appears to me to have been very receptive of the Bombay doctrine. I should have liked to call attention to some very remarkable statements in Sir James Westland's report, but as time is so very short I will not do so now. The right hon. gentleman said that in India the richer classes were accustomed to use the finer class of cloth, while the lower classes used cloth of poor description. I have been in India and my experience is different. I think that as a rule the Hindu uses a finer quality of cloth for his turban or headgear, a medium quality to place around his loins, and, in all probability, the coarser kind he uses in his own home. Now, Sir, it is urged that the voice of India is in favour of these duties, and the Secretary of State has made that a very strong point. But how has the voice of India shown itself. If that voice had been displayed by the vote of a public elective assembly similar to the House of Commons, then we could have taken it that the voice of India was in favour of these duties, but it has not been so. What do public assemblies do when they want to raise money to meet deficits? Do they not levy taxes upon the rich? In India, during the past few years, the income tax has been reduced by 35 per cent., and incomes ranging from 200 to 500 rupees have been exempted. I venture to quote here a few words from Sir John Strachey the late Finance Minister in India regarding taxation. He says: "The tendency of the India authorities is rather by indirect taxation to lay their burdens upon the poor than by direct taxation to obtain their supplies from the rich." These are the words of a very great authority. "There is no country where the taxes upon incomes is more just than in India, but there has been much difficulty in obtaining it, because it has been opposed by the richest and most powerful class who alone can make their views heard. The official class, in the absence of direct taxation, contribute almost nothing. The mercantile and professional classes have greatly benefitted from our Government, more so than any other class of the community, but they have paid almost nothing towards the support of the country except when direct taxation has been imposed upon them."

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: What is the date of that Report?

Mr. WHITELEY: 1888. I venture to make these further observations. The income tax has been reduced by 35 per cent. in India in the last few years. There is a tax upon all incomes over 500 rupees. Now, let me take the Land Tax. That tax is only one-fifth of the letting value of the land, and only one-twenty-fourth of the total product of the land. I ask agricultural members how they would appreciate such a situation as that? They have no tobacco duties in India, and their excise duties are considerably lower than ours. I am decidedly of the opinion of Sir Charles Bernard and Hon. Griffith Evans, that not only are death duties possible in India, but that they are very desirable, and would bring in a large additional revenue which now escapes taxation. Well, Sir, to pass on. As a rule, in this country when additional revenue is wanted the Chancellor of the Exchequer looks about for the most prosperous industries, and taxes them. But in India it is just the reverse. They look about, and in this case they take the cotton industry, and they protect it. We are not fighting in this case for ourselves; we are not struggling for our own pockets; we are not working only for our own interest and our own advantage; but on behalf of the millions of Lancashire operatives. A leader of them only the other day said to me that if these import duties remained upon cotton goods entering India they would either have to be content to receive less work or less wages. What is the condition of this industry? At the present time there are 35,000 looms standing idle, and in many districts mayors and philanthropic bodies are distributing bread and free meals to prevent the populace from starving. That is the condition of Lancashire at the present time, and it is a most unfortunate condition of affairs. (Hear, hear.) The Government has lately opened an inquiry into the question of how to administer relief to the unemployed. The unemployed in Lancashire do not want relief; they want work; and what we want is the opening of markets for our goods in all portions of the world. (Hear, hear.) We do not want the Government by their actions to restrict and to strangle those very markets which we enjoy. No district or country is more interested in the prosperity of India than Lancashire. The welfare of India is indissolubly bound up with that of Lancashire, and we shall be adopting a suicidal policy if we do, or attempt to do, anything that would injure permanently India's position. But we cannot favour Protection. The feeling of grievance and injury in Lancashire will undoubtedly rankle for a long time to come. We shall continue to agitate against these import duties, in season and out of season, until they are removed. (Hear, hear.) We have no wish to be unreasonable; we are only looking upon the interests of the operatives. (Hear, hear.) We urge that the duties should be equalised and assimilated, and that India should be taxed in exactly the same manner as Lancashire. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GOSCHEN: The first remark that I have to make to the House is this. The few observations with which I will trouble them I speak in my individual capacity, and I do not wish to pledge a single member who sits in any quarter of the House to assent to the views I hold. I deeply regret in the matter—the very great matter—that is before us that we are deprived of the presence of my right hon. friend the member for Manchester, whose views on this matter, which he expressed with great ability and great moderation at Manchester not very long ago, I hoped he would have been able to place before the House with that commanding power he always displays. (Hear, hear.) I wish to emphasize the fact that I am simply speaking for myself; but I msut say, on the other hand, that I am speaking for myself with very strong conviction indeed. Well, Sir, it is much to be regretted that the course of Indian financial legislation should have brought us to this point. We see on one side very decided opinion in India, and on the other side very decided opinion in Lancashire. We have on the one side India in financial distress seeking to make both ends meet, believing that there are very few other sources of taxation left to her, and very jealous as to the manner in which this assembly will conduct her interests; and on the other side we see an industry in Lancashire depressed—(hear)—finding it difficult to hold its own at the present moment, and entitled to the greatest sympathy on the part of this House. (Hear, hear.) My right hon. friend the member for Bury has not only justified, but I think has proved his loyalty to his constituents in bringing this matter before the House, and though there are differences of opinion on both sides of the House, though I know amongst hon. members opposite there are some who condemn the Government while there are others who will support it, we find the same situation on this side of the House. Nevertheless, it is best that this matter should be argued out on the floor of the House, and that neither in Lancashire nor in India should there be any misapprehension as to the spirit in which we approach this question. In what spirit do we approach it? For my own part, I felt deeply the appeal which was made to us by the Secretary of State for India when he reminded us that we are not only the representatives of our own constituencies, but that this House is the trustee for that great empire of India—(cheers)—for the prosperity of which we shall be held responsible—a responsibility which, up to this time, I hope we have discharged in

the eyes of the world with disinterestedness, and it would be a thousand pities if on some question of importance—but still not one of paramount importance—we should give the impression either to our Indian fellow-subjects or to the world that those principles of disinterestedness which have been at the foundation of our rule in India are no longer to be the guiding principles of the Government of this country. (Hear, hear.) I know how a question of this kind would be decided by other countries; there are some countries who, when they are brought face to face with a question which interests their fellow-subjects at home and their colonists abroad, would decide very quickly on the selfish course. The Secretary of State for India has quoted from the debate that took place in the Lords, and at which, as he said, there spoke ex-Viceroys of India, ex-Secretaries of State for India, and Lord Roberts who was throughly competent to judge of Indian matters, and he produced evidence which, had he not produced it, it would have been my duty to place before the House, that questions of this kind deeply interested the masses of India, and that these feelings cannot be brushed aside by any statements that this is an agitation got up simply by a limited class in India. The right hon. gentleman the member for Bury stated the case with the greatest possible moderation, but I admit that I regret one passage of his speech, I think based on some observations which I myself had seen in a pamphlet which has been circulated, to the effect that it was the Anglo-Indian feeling in India which was hostile to Lancashire. The pamphlet went a little further—it seemed to convey the impression that those men in India upon whose capacity, and upon whose impartiality and honesty our rule depends, had either been deceived or cajoled, or influenced by a small class of the Bombay millowners. I should be sorry that this House should feel that a charge like that should lie against those to whom we confide the interests of our fellow subjects. We have to show to the world that the men we send to govern India are straightforward men. (Hear, hear.) We try to send to India from this country the best administrators we can select, men who are superior to prejudice, and who will have a judgment of their own. (Cheers.) Yet a doubt has been thrown upon a class but for whom we should not be able to hold India. (Cheers.) We hold India just because we send out our best men to govern her. I am not one of those who believe that you can give European institutions to India—(hear, hear)—such assembles answer here. (Hear, hear.) I do not believe the Indian mind is constituted like ours, and hon. members opposite might imagine that I and others who think with me are belated in our views as to how India should be governed. But in proportion as I hold that India is not fit for such representative institutions I feel strongly that we are bound in duty to listen to the voice of the Indian people on questions affecting their interests. (Hear, hear.) We have on the one side powerful representations which deserve the most respectful consideration; and on the other hand we have representations from India. How ought we to treat the representations from India? Surely not simply as those of officials? In a question of this kind the voice of India must be heard. We cannot do otherwise in this House than listen carefully to those whom we send to that country with the very object of representing Indian opinion and interests to us, and we ought to extend to their advice the greatest respect. (Hear, hear.) The Council of India are against the exemption of these cotton duties, and we cannot altogether push aside their advice, because we have constituted that Council in order to be guided by them. The Secretary of State for India has said that he is bound to look mainly after the interests of India, and that he has also considered the interests of Lancashire. But it is not only the Secretary of State for India who is responsible; the whole Cabinet are responsible—(cheers)—for they might have overruled or attempted to overrule the right hon. gentleman if they thought that the question had not been sufficiently considered. There are two aspects in which this question might be regarded. In one respect it is one of the largest questions that can be brought before this House, and in another respect it may be shown to be a small question. The large question is the effect which an adverse vote of this House might have. (Cheers.) One expression has been used by the Secretary of State for India to-night which I do not think he was entitled to use unless he was deeply convinced that he ought to use it. He spoke of danger. (Hear, hear.) It was a very serious thing for the right hon. gentleman to say that the adoption of a particular course towards India—a course which many of the the right hon. gentleman's own party are prepared to support—would involve danger to that Empire, and it is a statement which cannot be ignored. (Hear, hear.) I am not at all sure but that the speeches made by Lord Lansdowne, Lord Northbrook and Lord Roberts—I do not say Lord Kimberley because he is a colleague of the right hon. gentleman—are not of a character to run counter to that declaration. It is not, therefore, a question of confidence in the Government, or a question of party. (Hear.) When we are told that any particular course involves danger to India, danger to Lancashire and its industries, danger to every industry in this country, danger to our power, we should sink every consideration of party, every consideration of particular interests, and should range ourselves boldly on the side of the Executive Government. (Cheers.) I have placed before the House frankly the larger aspects of the question. I will take now the smaller aspects. What is the exact point of my right hon. friend the member for Bury? What is it we are to vote against, if an opportunity is to be given us of voting against any particular proposition? Is it against the imposition of these duties at all? Or is it against the particular form with which the Government have arranged these excise duties? I ask my right hon. friend to give his particular attention to these questions. Does he say that the Government, in arranging these excise duties on an unsatisfactory basis, have established a protective system, although they are strongly committed against any such system? (Hear, hear.) Is that the main grievance of hon. members for Manchester? Let us be perfectly clear on this point. (Hear.) It is one thing to condemn import duties altogether; it is a second thing to condemn particularly the import duties on cotton, and it is a third thing not to condemn the import cotton duties alone, but to condemn them because they are imperfectly rectified by the system which the right hon. gentleman has introduced. I know that many of my hon. friends consider that the right hon. gentleman, notwithstanding the able speech he has made, has inadequately satisfied them with regard to that particular point. (Hear.) There are questions of detail connected with yarns and other points on which it is felt that the excise duty which he has established does not meet the case. Then what ought to be done? There ought to be a conference of all those who are interested so as to ensure the removal of these difficulties. (Cheers.) Are such great influences—such national powers I might say—as Lancashire and India to be put in a position of antagonism because they cannot agree as to the details of a tariff? This question ought to be dealt with in such a manner by the right hon. gentleman as will make it absolutely clear to the representatives of Manchester that he has carried out the policy to which his Government is deeply pledged, and to which he is equally pledged, viz., that there shall be no protective influence whatever in these duties. I feel this strongly, and I am not sure many hon. members do not also feel the same, that there has not been sufficient co-operation between Indian finance and English finance in the past. I might have been tempted on an occasion such as this, if the motion had been cast in a different direction, to say that we are entitled to ask from the Government that they should never have brought us to this present position of antagonism between Lancashire and India. (Hear.) The right hon. gentleman has had a good many mouths in which to deal with this question, and he must have known the feeling there was in Lancashire upon it. (Hear.) I cannot deny the courage of the right hon. gentleman: I think he has taken a very courageous view. But what he has not done is this: he has not brought the contending parties sufficiently together. (Hear, hear.) Now I should have wished that even at this last moment it had been found possible to effect, I will not say a compromise, but something in the nature of an armistice, for the sake of negotiations which should be carried on. (Cheers.) Is it really beyond the limits of the statesmanship of India and of this country to find any alternative for these import duties? Should it not be possible to deal otherwise with Indian finance than to be compelled to create and continue this antagonism which we all so very much regret? Whatever may be the result of this division to-night, whether the Government succeed, or whether they do not succeed, I think that this debate ought to be followed by an endeavour on the part of the Government to see whether they cannot bring Indian opinion and Manchester opinion closer together than they are at the present moment? (Hear, hear.) The difficulty after all is merely one of tariff and surely that

being so there need be no trouble in bringing the parties together. (Hear, hear.) But what is to be the effect of the present vote? What is the meaning of the present vote? If it were simply this that the Government excise is unsatisfactory and ought to be remedied, I think I should vote with my right hon. friend the member Bury in order to bring them to a better understanding of their position. (Hear, hear.) But I I look upon it that this vote is not simply a vote as to the tariff. (Hear, hear.) We must look to the effect on India—(hear, hear)—when the decision of to-night has been telegraphed there. If we were to treat this in the direction of simply voting against the Government because we think that the excise is imperfect. I humbly think, myself speaking from my own point of view that such a vote would be misinterpreted in India. (Hear, hear.) I cannot, I ought not, as representative for India, as well as for St. George's, Hanover Square, run the risk of having my vote so misinterpreted. (Hear, hear.) I know that India feels strongly that indeed there is an overwhelming feeling on this point, and under these circumstances I cannot think I should be doing my duty if I gave a silent vote on this question. Every man in every part of the House will do what he considers to be his duty on this occasion. (Hear.) The Government will do wrong if they look upon this simply as a vote regarding their own conduct and administration. They will do wrong if they take advantage of the feeling which those experience who think so much of the sentiments of India if they construe it as an expression of confidence in themselves. (Hear, hear.) I care not how my vote is interpreted one way or the other, as regards party or individuals. What I want is that India should thoroughly understand that in this House on both sides there is a determination that Indian feeling should be considered as much as the feeling of any part of the country. (Cheers.)

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I should have been disposed to rise later had it not been for the gravity of the speech of the right hon. gentleman. I hope there will never be wanting in this country men responsible for the prosperity of this great Empire, of which India perhaps forms the greatest part, who will be wanting in courage to take that line which in their deepest conviction is necessary for the security of both. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman deserves all credit, I think, for the language that he has used, and he may depend upon it that he shall not hear from me a word which will in any respect prevent that reconciliation of the great interests of this country and of India, of which he has expressed himself so ardently desirous. I must be permitted to claim also for Her Majesty's Government that it is in that spirit that we have acted. (Hear.) Sometimes in the heat of party debate it has been contended that the Government are actuated only by electioneering designs, that their object is to catch votes and to secure their political and party position. But do you think that when the Cabinet came to a decision upon this momentous question they were actuated by any such considerations? Do you think that they were not fully aware of the difficulties which they would create for themselves in Lancashire? Do you think they did not know that they were placing many of their own supporters in a very difficult position; that they were risking many votes which might be of importance to them at the moment. (Cheers.) But, Sir, this I will say, that the Government never hesitated for one single moment in taking that decision which they believed was necessary in the interests of the people of India, whatever effect that decision might have upon their own party or political future. (Cheers.) That I am entitled to say, and further, I will add, that in that respect the Government have acted in the same spirit as the right hon gentleman who has just addressed us. (Hear, hear.) I am not disposed myself to go at any length into this subject, or to occupy the time of the House on a matter which has been so ably, I was going to say, so splendidly, dealt with by the Secretary for India, who has shown how worthy he is to hold one of the noblest positions which can be held by an English statesman. (Cheers.) It is not necessary that I should say anything upon that point. I have only to repeat to the right hon. gentleman what my right hon. friend himself has said. He has stated how willing he is to go into considerations which might remove the sense of injustice, if it exists as to the protective operation of these duties. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman has invited that consideration: he has said that he is perfectly ready, and, indeed, anxious, to receive from the representatives of Lancashire their views upon this subject and to compare it with the relative information he may receive from India upon that head. I am happy to think that the feeling in Lancashire which my right hon. friend, the member for Bury, has described as being so bitter—as one that will never rest and which will always continue in a spirit of hostility on this question does not prevail in all quarters there. If it does there must have been a great falling off in the tone of the county. (Hear.) I hold in my hand a speech much worthier of Lancashire than that which we have heard from the member for Bury. That speech was one made by a man well known and highly respected in Lancashire; it was made at the annual meeting of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, it was made by the President of that Chamber, sir, F. Forbes Adams, a man who has quite as much knowledge of Lancashire as my right hon. friend; who does not speak on instructions upon this subject, but who speaks from the point of view of practical experience? What does the President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, dealing with this matter, say? He says he considers that there has been very great exaggeration as regards the effect these duties will have upon the trade and commerce of Lancashire. I have his exact words here, and I wish to be careful to use thom. He says: "There is no doubt that a large amount of business has been done with India during the past twelve months; the shipments were still large, even though there has been a recent decline in exchange. . . . I have seen in the newspapers what I regard as very exaggerated statements as to the effect of these duties upon the Lancashire trade." And then he goes on to say in reference to the points on which my right hon. friend calls for continued agitation in Lancashire—and I beg the attention of the House to these words, for they are worthy of the President of the Chamber of Commerce: "He saw it stated that there was to be a continuous agitation against these duties, and that they objected to them *in toto*. He did not pretend to think that any word he could say would have any influence outside, but if it had influence there was no word he could use which would be strong enough to express his desire to persuade those who were responsible for the agitation to cease. It was not worthy of the great fame of Lancashire, of its self-reliance, its stateliness, its stability, its solidness, or its record. What was the use of continuing an agitation which could not possibly be fruitful of good, and might possibly be pregnant with serious harm; for it could not fail to cause irritation and annoyance in our great dependency—a dependency to which Lancashire owed so much of her prosperity of past years, to which she owed so much now, and to which he hoped she would owe so much for centuries to come. I venture to say that language like this coming from a leading representative of Lancashire, is worthy of that great county and the great industries in it. I hope we shall have no more of these irritating statements. It is of the first importance that every man, whatever position of responsibility he holds, to maintain the feelings of confidence and goodwill between every part of this Empire. I deeply regret that it should have been thought necessary to have what must assume more or less of the character of a party and political division upon such a question as this. But, Sir, if the Government are called upon to meet that issue, they are ready to meet it. If it should be their fate to fall in such a cause, there is no cause, I think, in which a Government could more worthily fall. (Ministerial cheers.) But I should most deeply regret if the result of a vote of the House of Commons to-night be to establish a feeling of irritation between Lancashire and India, and leave upon the mind of the great population for whose welfare we are responsible the lasting sense that they had not justice to expect from the British House of Commons. (Cheers and counter cheers.)

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I need not apologise for taking part in this discussion at this hour. About twenty years ago, when the agitation commenced for the repeal of the cotton duties, I was the representative of the Indian Department, and the exponent of the policy of the Government of that day in this House. And therefore I hope the House will excuse me if I occupy its attention for a few minutes. I wish to say that the right hon. gentleman has reversed the policy which the House of Commons twenty years ago deliberately adopted, and he will find that in doing so he has embarl e l in troubles and disturbances of which he has little conception. The views which I myself held twenty years ago as to the impolicy of imposing cotton duties upon English goods, I hold still, and the distinguished chief under whom I then had the honour of serving, Lord Salisbury, held those views, and also holds them still.

(Cheers.) At the time I speak of, twenty years ago, an agitation went on against these duties, deputation after deputation of members of Parliament came to the Indian Office to urge the injustice of the taxation to which they and their constituents were subject. We looked most carefully into the situation and found that we could not meet the objectors in argument. The present Secretary of State for India is an able and distinguished man, but he must recollect that the two men who determined upon the abolition of the Indian cotton duties were men of the very highest distinction and authority in their respective spheres both of thought and action, namely, Sir Louis Malet and Lord Salisbury. The Secretary of State has quoted the name of Mr. Cobden, but the name of Sir Louis Malet in this matter stands higher in my opinion than that of Mr. Cobden. (Hear, hear.) Sir Louis Malet, who, during the earlier part of his life successfully devoted himself to breaking down the hostile tariffs of foreign countries, during the latter part of his life no less successfully devoted himself to establishing an unity of interest in this question between England and her great dependency. Now the grounds upon which at that time we arrived at the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary to abolish these duties were two-fold: First, the tax was an unfair tax as far as Lancashire was concerned, and that was part of the question to which Sir Louis Malet specially devoted his attention. Lord Salisbury looked at the question from another aspect altogether. He arrived at the conclusion that these duties ought to be abolished on the ground that their imposition was a subject of dangerous contention—dangerous to the stability of our Government in India. It was in that view that he induced the House of Commons to assent to our policy. The agitation was bitterly fought. The Duke of Argyll, then one of the leaders of the Liberal party, and the late Mr. Fawcett fought stubbornly against our policy, but, so conclusive was the argument, that we were able to pass a resolution with the unanimous assent of this House for the abolition of the cotton duties. In that resolution there was no mention of protection, but two years afterwards another resolution was assented to by the House of Commons on the same subject, and from that resolution all mention of protection was omitted, thus showing that it was the intention that these import duties should be abolished. A change of Government took place. The member for Midlothian came into office. In the meantime all duties which were in any sense protected had been removed. But they had arrived at a higher quality of cotton goods, and, owing to the way in which the tariff was adjusted, further action was necessary. The last relic of these import duties was then abolished. That was the policy deliberately arrived at after long consideration, and now, in the middle of a dull recess, without giving the House an opportunity for discussion, without consulting any representatives from Lancashire, and contrary to what we believed was the understanding, these duties were suddenly imposed. What is the plea? They say there was danger. Well, the House will recollect that a year ago, when there was an Indian Loan Bill before the House, the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed us that if the Bill did not pass India would be bankrupt. We are used to these statements. (Laughter.) I have been long connected with the administration of India, and I know something about India. I agree that we should listen to the voice of India, but if we want to hear the real voice of India, we must not go to Bombay and Calcutta for that purpose. Those semi-Europeanised cities do not represent India. (Hear, hear.) It is a peculiarity that certain sections of those two capitals, having adopted Western ideas, have adopted with singular skill the Western methods of agitation. They have their press and their political organisations. The result is that there is no country on the face of the world where the shrieking units of society can make themselves so well heard, and where the dumb millions are so quiescent, as in India. (Laughter and cheers.) I know the gentlemen who get up these agitations. Let the right hon. gentleman propose an income-tax or death duties, and he will very soon find out that there is much more danger in proposing taxation than in dealing with cotton. (Laughter.) These people are always opposed to any taxation of any sort that touches themselves, and when there is any difficulty to be met they always say, "Oh! tax cotton or raise the salt duty." (Laughter.) The most important part of the speech of the right hon. gentleman was that in which he gave his reasons for the necessity of these duties. He said that the deficiency which existed last year had been increased by the fall in exchange from 1s. 2d. to 1s. 1d. This shows how largely this is a currency question, but the Government have resolutely refused to listen to any proposal made from any quarter for the reform of the currency. The Government having refused the proposals of the Indian Government for a conference, resorted to the remedy of closing the mints for the manufacture of silver, by which they attempted to give an artificial value to the rupee. That was a quack remedy which reduced the price of silver all over the world. The merit claimed for it was that it would ensure the rupee's remaining at 1s. 3d. for purposes of exchange, but the rupee has fallen to 1s. 1d., and in consequence of that fall the Government are now imposing cotton duties on goods imported into India. Is this the only remedy open to the Government? If it is, and if silver should continue to fall, even this 5 per cent. duty will not be sufficient to meet the deficiency, and the Government will have to keep on increasing the duty. It is, therefore, necessary at the outset of this policy to protest strongly against a measure which must result in the erection of so hostile barrier against the importation of cotton goods into India. The Secretary of State for India has made a very candid and conciliatory speech, and I understood the right hon. gentleman to undertake to eliminate from his plan anything approaching or resembling Protection. The right hon gentleman has also said that he has safeguarded the interests of Lancashire by the imposition of an Excise duty. But has he really done what he thought? For my part I disbelieve altogether in the efficiency of an Excise duty for that purpose. (Hear, hear.) The opinion of those who considered this question twenty years ago was that the imposition of Excise duties in India could not be viewed as a satisfactory method of taxation, and the reason was that in India there was not a reliable official machinery for the purposes of investigation and taxation. Judging from the experience supplied by the past, I hold that there is very little likelihood of this proposed Excise duty being enforced and fulfilling the purpose for which it is intended. I will test the right hon. gentleman's undertaking to reconsider any part of his scheme which can be shown to savour of Protection. The foundation of the legislation of the right hon. gentleman was that the price of American cotton was 4d. a pound. (Hear, hear, and cries of "No.") But supposing that it can be purchased under 4d. and at 3d., the coarser goods manufactured out of it could compete with the coarser goods made in India. If this should prove to be the case, would the right hon. gentleman put an excise duty on the coarse goods in India, so that the Lancashire goods might not be handicapped by the import duty? Then, why is the excise duty to be levied upon yarn and the customs duty upon cloth? Surely, considering the difference in value between yarn and cloth, that amounts to Protection. The right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for India adopted a very high doctrine when he said he had to pay very special attention to the wishes of India. I agree, but if we are always to pay attention to the wants of India, are the positions to be reciprocal? (Hear, hear.) The Indian Government must pay some attention to the wishes and wants of the English electors. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman asked if they would attempt to deal with any self-governing colony on the same principle as it was proposed to apply to India. There is no point of resemblance between India and a self-governing colony. Self-governing colonies are self-supporting and self-maintaining. The Government of India is neither the one nor the other —(hear, hear)—and only lives on the moral and material support which it derives from England. If we deprive the Indian Government of the financial and military assistance it derives from England it will fall into a state of inanition and collapse. (Hear, hear.) England has paid a heavy tax, both in blood and money, for having set up a Government in India, and nobody—it may surprise some hon. members to hear it—who has ever looked into it would arrive at any other conclusion than that it is in no sense a good financial bargain. We have to maintain a large military force, some 60,000 young soldiers, and the death rate amongst these in India is some indication of the price we pay for the maintenance of our Government. It is not an empire artificially created and artificially maintained, and we should not make a selfish use of our power to exclude Indian ideas or wishes from influencing the Government of the country. (Hear, hear.) But at the same time we have a right to say that such a system as this should not be tolerated. We ought to express an opinion on the mis-policy of the Government in imposing these duties. In Lancashire there are great political

interests and industrial wealth and of course she is feeling irritation and I hope that by means other than political agitation these duties may either be weakened or repealed for I should much regret if they were carried by means of political agitation outside and inside this House. (Cheers.) I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman who moved this motion is going to divide or whether he will be satisfied by the statement made by the Secretary of State for India. If he does divide I shall be happy to vote with him. (Hear, hear.) The Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for India seem to believe that a general party vote must be taken to-night upon the question of these cotton duties which almost is to be made to turn out the Government. The speeches on this side of the House I think must have disposed of any such rumour. (Hear, hear.) Differences of opinion there were when these cotton duties were abolished and when they were imposed, and I am sure the Secretary of State for India, short time as he has been in office, has found that he has put his heel into a nest of hornets by assenting to this unwise proposition. (Laughter.) What we wish to do in India is to impose all that is stable and permanent into the Government but we are forced to submit its policy, its arrangements, its duties, and all its wishes to a popular assembly. Twelve years ago we unanimously abolished these duties and I regret that they have been re-imposed, and if a division takes place I will vote with those who moved the adjournment of the House. I shall do so as a protest against the Government for their inaction on the currency question and against the imposition of the cotton duties. I shall also vote in favour of the motion as a protest against the unwisdom and unfairness of putting the whole burden of saving the solvency of the Indian Government on the shoulders of one already very distressed industry. (Cheers.)

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji: At this late hour I shall not occupy the House very long, but I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite: Does England spend a single farthing in connection with India? Hon. gentlemen say they are maintaining the Empire. It is something extraordinary! For the two hundred years they have been connected with India they have not spent a single farthing either on the acquisition or the maintenance of the Empire. However, I will not go into that large question. (Hear, hear.) Did I wish to see the Empire in India endangered, were I a rebel at heart, I should welcome this motion with the greatest delight. The great danger to the Empire is to adopt methods of irritation, which if continued will assuredly bring about disintegration. (Hear, hear.) I appeal to the Unionists to vote against this motion or they will drive the first nail in the coffin of British rule in India. You may, as Lord Roberts has told you, have a stronger and larger army in India than you have at present; you may have that army perfection itself; but your stability rests entirely upon the satisfaction of the people. (Hear, hear.) I heard with great satisfaction hon. members on both sides of the House recognise this important fact, that after all, the whole safety of the British rule depends upon the satisfaction of the people, and the justice that may be done towards them. Remember whatever you are, you are still like a stepmother—children may submit to any amount of oppression from their own mother, and will be affectionate towards her, but from their stepmother they will always demand the strictest justice. (Hear, hear.) You must remember that you as an alien people have to rule over a large number of people in the Indian Empire, and if you do not consult their feelings, you will make a very great mistake. I am quite sure that I appeal not in vain to the Unionists, and can I appeal to the Home Rulers. (Hear, hear.) If they mean Home Rule, they mean that it must be entirely on the integrity of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) I have never known a motion brought before this House which was more separatist than the one before it now. (Hear, hear.) I can count upon the votes of Home Rulers. The passing of this motion would be the passing of a motion of disunion. Perhaps you may not feel the effect for some time, but I impress upon this great assembly —that though a revolution may not take place to-morrow, it is the accumulation of many years, of many disappointments, many inattentions, that at last produces a revolution. Do not forget 1857. I, for one, desire from the bottom of my heart that the British rule and connection with India may last for a very long time. (Hear, hear.) They are dealing with many millions of people, and I desire and hope that India to-morrow will not receive a telegram saying that this motion has been passed. The feeling of injustice is very strong there. India has its agitators. What were the occupiers of the Treasury Bench? Did they not go up and down the country endeavouring to educate the people and to disseminate their own opinions? And so does the Opposition and every member. It is by peaceful agitation alone that British India is to be preserved. This is not the first occasion that our Lancashire friends have tried to force the hands of the Government to do certain things adverse to India. They began in 1700. But I am not going on this grave occasion to enter into any petty quarrel with them. (Hear, hear.) This I will say, British India is too poor to buy Manchester goods. People talked of the enormous Manchester trade. There was no such enormous trade, unless 15s. 6d. per head per annum was an enormous trade. I appeal to all parties not to let this motion pass. (Hear, hear.) I appeal to you not to let a telegram go forth to India, saying that it has been passed. It will have a very bad effect there. You have your remedy in the assurance of the Secretary for India, that if you can point out how to remove the alleged protective character of these duties, he will do it. You are bound to be satisfied with that assurance. I again earnestly hope that the motion will not be allowed to pass. (Hear, hear.)

Sir Frederick Milner: I have given very careful consideration to this question and endeavoured to read both sides. I look upon this as an Imperial question, and I feel that if this motion were carried it would have a very serious effect on the country; therefore, as I have never given a dishonest vote in this House, I feel constrained to vote with the Government in this case. But I am in this difficulty—it has been laid down during the debate on the Address on behalf of the Government that if you gave your vote with a different party to which you belong, and if you go into the same lobby with them that therefore you must be considered to be an associate which I should very much dislike to be supposed. (Cheers.) If I go into the lobby with the Government to-night I may say that I do not in any way associate myself with them, because I look upon the Government as a most mischievous Government. (Much laughter.)

The House divided just before midnight. The figures were:

For Sir Henry James's Motion	109
Against	304
Government majority ..	195

The announcement of the figures was received with general cheering.